Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA.

. NUARY TO DECEMBER, 1896.

VOL. VII. NEW SERIES.

London:
PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

1896.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 1. (NEW SERIES.) JANUARY, 1896. [Subscription, Post F[illegible] SIX SHILLINGS PER [illegible] IN INDIA, SIX RU[illegible]

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Indiana: Notes on Indi[illegible]	[illegible]
The Judiciary and the [illegible]	
I.—By [illegible] Garth	[illegible]
II.—By [illegible] Phear	[illegible]
III.—By [illegible] A. F. [illegible], LL.D.	9
IV.—By [illegible]	10
The Betrayal of Kafiris[illegible] Ex-Diplomatic	11
The Indiscretions of Sir [illegible] by A. [illegible]	12
British Opinions on Indi[illegible]	
The [illegible] and the Executive	13
Tori[illegible] Cotton Duties	14
The Poona Congress: [illegible]	16
The Eleventh Congress	17
The Great Mogul	1[illegible]
Ditticisms	20
Our London Letter	21
Lord Hobhouse on Indian Affairs	22
Lord G. Hamilton on the Cotton Duties	24
Lord James's reply to Sir H. James	26
Reviews: A Soldier of the Mutiny	26
Myths and Folk-Lore	28
Indian Stories	29
"Twenty-one Days in India"	29
The Second Jungle-Book	30
The Story of the Sea	30
"The Relief of Chitral"	31
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	32
Recent Official Publications	32

Indiana.

The Judiciary and the Executive.

We pr[illegible] on another page a series of import[illegible] communications upon the relatio[illegible] of the Executive to the Judici[illegible] in India, with reference to the "interview" wi[illegible] Mr. Manomohan Ghose which appeared in our iss[illegible] for December last. It would be impossible to ex[illegible] the significance of the opinions expressed by Sir Richard Garth, who speaks with the authority of a Privy Councillor and a former Chief Justice of Bengal, and by Sir J. B. Phear, who after holding the office of Judge of the High Court of Calcutta was appointed Chief Justice of Ceylon. These [illegible] authorities confirm the grave allegations made by Mr. Manomohan Ghose—allegations which, we [illegible] were proved in each instance by reference to ascertained cases—and, while the experience of Sir J. B. Phear in Ceylon strengthens the [illegible] reform, Sir Richard Garth declares, on the strength of indisputable evidence, that the Government of India approves the scandalous [illegible] described by Mr. Ghose, and would be very [illegible] to [illegible] it altered. The facts which Mr. Ghose [illegible] to light have, we are happy to find, recei[illegible] some attention at the hands of the [illegible], though but an inconsiderable [illegible] of [illegible] which they [illegible]. Sir Richard Garth makes the e[illegible]

Mr. Ghose's statement should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons. We propose not only to carry out this suggestion but also, on the eve of the re-opening of Parliament to issue a pamphlet containing, in addition to Mr. Ghose's statement and a collection of authoritative opinions upon it, the scheme of reform formulated in our columns by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt more than two years ago. Further steps, we understand, will also be taken by members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to bring the whole matter to the notice of Parliament and of the Secretary of State for India. It will then, at any rate, be no longer possible for apologists of the present system to maintain that it is continued because of the ignorance of those who, in the last analysis, are responsible for [illegible] and for the hateful injustice that it so frequently encourages.

The Viceroy's Tour.

Considering the difficulties which a bureaucratic Government must alw[illegible] experience in learning the wants [illegible] wishes of the people co[illegible] charge, we are amazed to discover [illegible] how reluctant the Government of [illegible] of such channels of communi[illegible] at the late General it is true, go[illegible] of the trick was the a more [illegible] author was Lord George

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

from four to two per c

erest which concern not m
community at large,' Lord
t "this is an inconvenient
ssing qustions of that kin
ert with some confidence th
ue to gneral statements m
r repreentative, when the
rsial topics in a short and s
ust have full knowledge of
eceded the conclusion, or
cussing them at the time; and
s a painful, if not intolerable,
lying to a welcome should
ntrovert acts or challenge
not accept, but equaly cannot
the spirit of these remarkable
gin proceeded to suggest t
pressed by the Sabha were n
cussion at all; to dismiss their re
subject of enhanced rents with a
t if he had time and opport
oduce facts and figure which wou
say that responsibility in respe
turbances rested with the police;
t a "wholly disproportionate e
en "got up over" the Jury Bi
rely, strange words for a Liberal
hard to see what useful purpose
ve imagined that they would se
the address drafted by the M
bha the Madras Government requ
three useful paragraphs discussi
litary expenditure and the con
on the rayats and neglect of pu
bha rightly declined to present i
ntiated form so fatuously sugges

Lord Elgin Refutes Himself.

We do no wonder t
parture of the Vicer
surprise nd regre
remark tht it is "i
of tacitrnity whic
present Aministrati
has been the practi
bodies o the cou
Governo-General'
before im the vic
s not merly of loca
d general importa
the time of Lord R
d Dufferin It was
ae. The *Hindu*
e addres that
the rep es which
reply il
uch opp

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

municat[illegible] r servants, the Gov[illegible] e Jury Bill Lord E[illegible] which had excited [illegible] merely in order [illegible] deliberately conside[illegible] Legislative Council." [illegible] explanation on Lor[illegible] pposed that the p[illegible] so purely acader[illegible] n re-settlement, [illegible] erstood the view [illegible] ic opinion. The [illegible] e been removed in [illegible] is earnestly to be hoped that Lor[illegible] his own and the Government's sa[illegible] ople's sake, will see the error of [illegible] ould understand it," the *Hindu* [illegible] llector of a district desired to exp[illegible] table truths from a public addr[illegible] ted to the Governor; but that t[illegible] the Queen should betray simila[illegible] wise and questions of public p[illegible] and can be justified [illegible] their inclusion would [illegible] Lack of courage to fa[illegible] manlike manner is th[illegible] a Viceroy could ass[illegible] debatable topics; bu[illegible] excused if they attri[illegible] present attitude of L[illegible] men who read criti[illegible] "Pudet hœc opprob[illegible] potuisse refelli."

The Bureaucrat can do no wrong.

Sir Cha[illegible] tion as [illegible] was re[illegible] by Mr. Parbat C. Roy, see[illegible] taken the bull boldly [illegible] retirement. Accordin[illegible] of the *Times* he "p[illegible] farewell dinner give[illegible] "against the princi[illegible] ficials." "Here's [illegible] ay. Sir Charles [illegible] regarded as a humou[illegible] as reported by the [illegible] quotation. This "p[illegible] officials obtained," h[illegible] India, where it was t[illegible] the efficiency of the [illegible] lowered the prestig[illegible] should be avoided." [illegible] fail us if we were t[illegible] really immortal word[illegible] at a few of the facet[illegible]

[illegible] from the duties will is "the principle of the pu[illegible] ect of several bad opium Presumably it is the ord[illegible] elt next year; that the the good and blaming the bad. It will be news to many to learn that in India alone is this principle to be found in operation. There are those, perchance, in Whitehall who will hear it with surprise, not unmingled with amusement. We relish especially that phrase "the more unnecessary." Sir C. Elliott's argument plainly is that the most inefficient Civil Servants ought not to be censured, and that, where they are efficient, censure is especially superfluous. We can imagine—but then again perhaps we cannot—the frantic enthusiasm which such sentiments would naturally excite at a Civil Service dinner. For Sir Charles Elliott's closing epigram we have indeed nothing but praise. Civil Servants, especially bureaucratic Civil Servants in India, cannot do better than "avoid public censure." To this end they have an excellent [illegible] and Lord Ripon that the their eyes [illegible] policy [illegible] used, instead of diminishing, the danger of Russian invasion. It was not because, with General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Charles Gough, they perceived the folly of paving the way for a hostile army. It was not because, with Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour, they grasped the fact that the "forward" policy lay at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government of India. It was not because, having secured the relief of Dr. Robertson and his gallant force, they had accomplished the only avowed purpose of the Chitral expedition. It was not because they had issued a proclamation declaring that their sole object was to put an end to aggression on Chitral territory, and that as soon as this object had been attained the force would be withdrawn. No, it was for none of these reasons that Lord Rosebery and his colleagues came to the war decision which their successors so hastily reversed. It was merely as a sop to the "Little Englanders" who had been annoyed by the annexation of Uganda, and whose goodwill was desirable on the eve of a General Election. So, at least, we are assured by that veracious gentleman, Lord George Hamilton. The late Government's decision was, he informed an audience on November 26th, merely an electioneering dodge, and to this end the wicked Liberals were prepared "to throw away all the fruits of the successful expedition to Chitral, and to abandon the country where the successful operations had taken place." The methods of the "gentlemanly" party are peculiar, if not exactly convincing. India was, indeed, made to serve an electioneering turn at the late General Election. But the subject of the trick was the cotton duties, and its author was Lord George Hamilton.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

from four to two per ent. some years after the construction of the railway." So far, so good. But it now appears, from an official answer to an interpellation, that while the Government of Madras was willing to give effect to the liberal policy enunciated by Lord Ripon's Government in 1883, this policy was, in 1885, disallowed by the Secretary of State. What is still more curious is that the despatch of the Secretary of State to this effect was not, apparently, communicated to the Madras Government until the end of 1893. The Madras Government was then compelled, after this delay, to revise its policy accordingly. "Between 1885 and 1893, that is, for a space of eight years, the local Government was kept in ignorance of the fact of the great scheme for re-settlement which Lord Ripon so humanely and wisely promul- ed having been set aside by the Secretary of suit the new retrograde e usual official publi- that is, till Ma- oduce

Lord Elgin Refutes Himself.

knows, was not all, nor the most significant incident. Immediately before the division was taken the cotton duties were denounced by Lord George Hamilton in a set speech in which he stated that he spoke with the express approval and agreement of Lord Salisbury himself. Lord George Hamilton declared in this authoritative fashion, and ostensibly on behalf of the Tory party, that the cotton duties were unjust and unfair, impolitic and inexpedient. That speech, together with Sir H. James's speech and the divisionlists, formed the basis of the Conservative appeal to Lancashire at the General Election. The *St. James's* now repudiates "whatever individual members of the Ministry may have said when they were in positions of greater freedom and less responsibility." But this summary attempt to dispose of the matter, ungracious as it is to Lord G. Hamilton and Lord James, will not suffice. For when Lord G. Hamilton had been appointed Secretary for India and a Cabinet Minister, he went out of his way to re- in the most emphatic terms and at the most moment, the opinions which he had ex- say that with Lord Salisbury's sanction in February. turbances speak in the Accrington division of at a "wa on behalf of the Tory candidate on the en "got polling, he wrote that he was too busy to rely, stra he added that his speech against the hard to which he still adhered, and which had ve ima wed by his appointment to the India Office, the addr lp Conservative candidates in Lancashire. bha the M *mes's* may well be anxious to forget this three use probably, under all the circumstances, the litary exp alous incident in recent political history. on the ray bha rightl ated for

---

The question of Lord G. Hamilton's electioneering tactics, aided and abetted by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour, is one thing. The question of the cotton duties themselves is another thing. When the election was over, and the Conservatives had a majority of 152, Mr. Balfour, who as the candidate for East Manchester had said a great deal to encourage and very little indeed to assuage the demands and expectations of the electors, roundly declared that there was a vast difference of opinion between Lord George Hamilton and his predecessor. It would be idle to exaggerate the interest with which the people of Lancashire regard this question, and the amazing thing is that the opponents of "forward" frontier policy are not exerting themselves more in order to direct this quite unusual concentration of public interest in Indian affairs into the most useful channel. Already the people of India have begun to ask what were the causes of financial embarrassments in India that led

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to the re-imposition of the cotton duties, and already many of them are coming to perceive that the chief cause was extravagant military expenditure, especially upon useless and worse than useless schemes of trans-frontier aggression. Yet it does not appear that the Liberal party, who opposed the retention of Chitral, are bestirring themselves in order to drive this lesson home. The opportunity is, however, singularly promising, as the Lancashire Conservative members who are most prominent in the condemnation of the cotton duties approved the retention of Chitral and voted against Mr. Maclean's amendment last September. Whatever else the cotton duties may or may not have done they have certainly proved to Lancashire that the evil results of financial extravagance in India are not confined to the people of India alone. This inkling of a community of interest should be developed and turned to good account. We repeat what we have said before, that there is now offered to all whom it may concern an exceptional opportunity of fostering in a large and important section of the British electorate a deep and sympathetic interest in wise and economical administration in India.

The Financial Outlook.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to the deputation was, as will be seen from a quotation from the *Manchester Guardian* which we print elsewhere, received with little satisfaction in Lancashire. In view of his previous utterances on the same subject no other result was to be expected. Lord George Hamilton now takes up precisely the position which was taken up by Sir Henry Fowler, namely, that the cotton duties are necessary in order to produce financial equilibrium in India, that they can be repealed only when that equilibrium comes to be independent of them, and that in the meantime, far from desiring "protection," he is anxious to secure perfect equality of treatment for Lancashire and Bombay. It is significant that, in the opinion of the Secretary of State at least a few years must elapse before the duties are likely to be repealed. If he had talked in this vein last February, or write in this strain last July, it may be doubted whether he would now be Secretary of State, and it is certain that the Parliamentary representation of Lancashire would be different from what it is. His speech has, however, been welcomed with natural jubilation in Calcutta and Bombay. News from both centres states that the prospects of the Government of India have lately improved, and chiefly through the more hopeful state of exchange. Sir J. Westland may be able to announce something like equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. On the other hand it is pointed out that, as the cotton imports have fallen off, the average, the estimated income from the duties will not be realised; that the effect of several bad opium seasons will be acutely felt next year; that the saving in sterling liabilities on account of exchange compensation will be "more than absorbed by Chitral"; and that, consequently, there will certainly not be sufficient margin for the repeal of the cotton duties. It is to be hoped that this reference to Chitral will be laid to heart by the Lancashire electors whose representatives — having pledged themselves to secure the immediate repeal of the cotton duties — straightway supported Lord Salisbury's Government in the retention of Chitral.

A Handsome Explanation.

We know now why Lord Rosebery and his colleagues unanimously decided to withdraw from Chitral. It was not because they agreed with Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon that the "forward" policy increased, instead of diminishing, the danger of Russian invasion. It was not because, with General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, Sir Donald Stewart and Sir Charles Gough, they perceived the folly of paving the way for a hostile army. It was not because, with Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour, they grasped the fact that the "forward" policy lay at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government of India. It was not because, having secured the relief of Dr. Robertson and his gallant force, they had accomplished the only avowed purpose of the Chitral expedition. It was not because they had issued a proclamation declaring that their sole object was to put an end to aggression on Chitral territory, and that as soon as this object had been attained the forces would be withdrawn. No. It was for none of these reasons that Lord Rosebery and his colleagues came to the wise decision which their successors so hastily reversed. It was simply as a sop to the "Little Englanders" who had been annoyed by the annexation of Uganda, and whose goodwill was desirable on the eve of a General Election. So, at least, we are assured by that veracious gentleman, Lord George Hamilton. The late Government's decision was, he introduced an audience on November 10th, merely an election-dodge, and to this end the wicked Liberals were prepared "to throw away all the results of the successful expedition to Chitral, and to abandon the country where the successful operations had taken place." The methods of the "gentlemanly" party are peculiar, if not exactly convincing. India was, indeed, ready to serve an electioneering turn at the late General Election. But the object of the trick was the cotton duties, and the author was Lord George Hamilton.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"Only a Little One."

The cry is "still they come." Hardly have the echoes of the Chitral engagements died away when the news comes from Calcutta that a punitive expedition is being sent to the Lushai Hills. Thus does East answer to West with the senseless lust of war. The information which is vouchsafed to us is that "a small expedition of 600 rifles is being sent to the North Lushai hills in two columns, operating from Assam and Burma. The object is to punish Kairuma, a chief who has always been hostile. His district is the only one which is not under complete control." It is the old story. The rupees of Indian taxpayers are to be squandered with the usual recklessness, while Parliament ignores the folly, and even cotton-spinning Lancashire returns representatives to encourage it. The latest scene for the operations of restless and ambitious military officers in India is a district in Upper Burma, lying to the North of the Arakan Hill Tracts and the South of Manipur. A heavy score already stands against it in the account-book of the Indian taxpayer, as the following statement of the Government of India's war bill for the last eighteen years will show:—

	Rs.
Afghanistan	181,901,320
Egypt..	12,240,160
Burma	60,735,000
Quetta	22,880,710
Hazara	3,110,320
Lushai and Chin Hills	8,397,740
Sikkim	2,859,160
Manipur	3,234,070
Miranzai	1,965,360
"Minor Operations"	3,265,530
Mobilization	4,059,450
Camps of Exercise	1,462,270
	306,111,090

Three hundred and six millions of rupees in eighteen years! Lord George Hamilton informed the deputation from Lancashire a fortnight ago that the repeal of the cotton duties was conditional upon the restoration of financial equilibrium in India. How many of the wiseacres who constituted that deputation will reflect that, unless precedent is egregiously departed from in this case, the present useless expedition against the inoffensive Kairuma will swallow up a good deal more than the total yield of the cotton duties during the whole twelve months? And the present expedition, as the mother in the story said of her infant, is "only a little one."

"British Subjects" in South Africa.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji introduced to Mr. Chamberlain last August a deputation of Indian gentlemen resident in London who protested against the disabilities imposed upon British Indian subjects under various Governments in South Africa. To the grievances which were then brought to the notice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies another has since been added. On October 7th last the Volksraad of the South African Republic, in a resolution ratifying the treaty between the British Government and the Government of the South African Republic which protected British subjects in the Republic from compulsory military service, went out of its way to declare that the term British subjects meant only white persons. The British Indian Defence Committee at Johannesburg at once despatched a telegram to London protesting against this odious and iniquitous racial distinction, and the telegram has now been supplemented by a concise Memorial. There is, of course, no reason in the world why the exemption granted to British subjects who happen to be of one colour should be denied to British subjects who happen to be of another colour. The Indian resident in the Transvaal is not a burgher. He is, equally with British residents, denied civil rights. His political exemptions ought equally to correspond with his civic disabilities. The Memorial was at once forwarded to Mr. Chamberlain by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who added a covering letter in these terms:—

"In continuation of the deputation which I had the honour of introducing to you on August 29th on the subject of the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa, I have now to submit to you copies of a telegram and of a Memorial which I hope may have independently reached you. You will observe that the whole point of this reference consists in the fact that, in ratifying the recent treaty, the Government of the South African Republic took upon itself to define British subjects, therein referred to, as only white persons, thereby depriving all British Indian subjects of that protection from compulsory military service which Her Majesty's Government had found it necessary to insist upon for all British subjects. I venture to hope that you will see your way to disallow this arbitrary limitation of the meaning of the term 'British subjects.'"

The Government of the Transvaal is making itself conspicuous for retrogade policy, but this piece of arrogance is too cool. To inflict the penalties of citizenship upon those who are denied its rights is inequitable. To undertake to limit the meaning of the term British subjects is a piece of effrontery which Mr. Chamberlain will surely refuse to tolerate.

India's Sea-borne Trade.

The returns of the "Trade and Navigation of British India" are issued monthly from the Government Press at Calcutta. Few copies of these compendious tables of current Indian commerce seem which reach this country. No doubt merchants, bankers who are regularly engaged in transactions, and monetary transactions with our great opponents dependency find all the statistics relating these unusual their own prices current and shipping reports, and affairs economists and statisticians, who desire to comprehensive survey of the whole core the causes and monetary relations between India and India that led

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of the world, the case is somewhat different. They are not so much concerned with the details of the current course of trade; they more generally wish to look at the large totals and especially to compare one year with another on a series of years. Thus they have to postpone such surveys until the Statistical Department of the Government of India issues its finally revised returns for quinquennial periods. With the aid of these monthly returns of Indian sea-borne commerce it is (writes an Anglo-Indian correspondent) possible to combine, to some extent, retrospective lessons with indications of the net results of India's trade at a much later date. This will be more obvious if we set out the totals of the last available six months ending with September and showing the corresponding periods for the two previous years; these returns always presenting a triennal comparison. Here is a statement which exhibits that comparison at a glance:—

SEA-BORNE TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA:

THREE HALF-YEARS, MARCH TO SEPT., 1893-4-5.

EXPORTS.	1893. Rx.	1894. Rx.	1895. Rx.
Merchandise	50,9[illegible]	53,622,769	52,283,000
Treasure	1,9[illegible]	5,080,399	2,296,448
	52,88[illegible]	58,703,168	54,579,448
IMPORTS.			
Merchandise	33,650,319	34,704,026	33,708,799
Treasure	9,624,518	5,121,850	5,971,784
	43,274,837	39,825,876	39,680,583
Excess of India's Exports over Imports	9,611,191	18,877,292	14,898,865

A Crushing Adverse Balance.

This plan of dealing only with the clear totals presents to economists the one great fact that differentiates the course and results of Indian commercial transactions from those of nearly all other countries in the world. In those three half-years India's trade outgoings were more than her incomings by Rx.43½ millions. It may be queried whether, since the half-years in the above table include the season when Indian export business is more active than the other six months, that excess is not rather beyond the average. But the Secretary of State's "Explanatory Memorandum" shows that the excess of India's exports over her imports in 1893-4 was Rx. 13,321,000, and in 1894-5 Rx. 34,082,000, that is—a total for the two years of Rx.47½ millions. In the former of these two years there had been returned to India "en-faced rupee paper" to the amount of Rs.1,800,000 which *pro tanto* reduced the excess exports in that year from the figure of Rx.15,121,000. This unusual transfer of Government paper—as also Rx. 1,572,000 in the previous year, 1892-3—was one incident consequent on the disturbance of trade arising from the uncertainty of the fate of silver and speculation in expectation of the closing of the Indian mints to free coinage. But this was only a temporary and surface eddy in the constant stream of excess exports from India, by far the larger proportion of which flows into and sustains the channels of commercial prosperity in the United Kingdom. There is one other incidental remark to be made on the above table; namely, that while in the year 1893-4 the net import of silver into India was about Rx.8 millions (gold, nearly balancing) in 1894-5, there was a large export of gold—nearly four million tens of rupees—and, for the first time in a series of years, India's imports and exports of treasure nearly balanced. These incidental variations, though they have interest in their bearing on current transactions of the merchant and banker, are all within the one great fact to which the attention of statesmen and economists must be more and more directed, that India sends out, year after year, tens of millions worth of her revenues and resources, more than she receives, though, as Mr. Giffen has demonstrated, the normal condition of any country is that its figure of imports shall exceed its exports. In India's never adjusted commercial balance-sheet is exhibited the chief explanation of her weak industrial material condition. This is evidence that the most fatuous optimist cannot gainsay. When and how will responsible statesmen set themselves to redress this crushing adverse balance?

The Eleventh Congress.

We print on another page a brief telegraphic report, received just before we go to press, of the early proceedings of the Eleventh Indian National Congress, which met at Poona on December 27th. The report is too meagre for extended notice, but it will be disappointing to those amiable persons who, with the thought that is the offspring of the wish, have persuaded themselves that the strength of the Congress is waning. An organization which can muster some 1,600 delegates and 1,000 visitors from all parts of so vast a country is in a fairly robust condition. The Congress has passed the age of infancy, with its troubles and travails, its fears and anxieties. It was an outbreak of cholera that accidentally prevented the first Congress from meeting in Poona, the seat of Brahmanical orthodoxy. The Congress pavilion is a magnificent structure erected for the purpose near Fergusson College, on the way to Gunesh Khind, the site of Government House. It will be seen that the President laid special stress upon simultaneous examinations, the Finance Commission, and the speedy return of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to the House of Commons.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

I.—By the Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, Q.C.,

Late Chief Justice in Bengal.

To the Editor of "India."

Dear Sir,—I am much obliged to you for the copy which you have been kind enough to send me of what passed at the "interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose upon the much vexed question of the unseemly conflict which is still going on in India between the Judicial and Executive Services.

Mr. Ghose's able exposition of the true nature of that conflict and the disgraceful state of things to which it has given rise in Bengal is, I am sorry to say, only too true; and no man is better qualified than he is to deal with this subject, because for the last 25 years he has had a large experience at the Calcutta Bar, and has more especially devoted himself to criminal practice in the Mofussil, so that he has himself been actually engaged in a large number of the cases which he describes, and knows as well as any man the evils of the present system, the grievous injustice to which it is constantly giving rise, and the utter fallacy of the excuses which are made by the Government for not rectifying this shameful abuse.

The real truth is, as Mr. Ghose tells us, and as Sir Charles Elliott and some other high officials in India are honest enough openly to avow, that the Government of India *approves* this scandalous system, and (whatever the Secretary of State may say to the contrary) would be very sorry to see it altered. In point of fact, if the Government had its will, the independence of the judges would be still further controlled, and the High Courts themselves made subservient to the will of the Executive.

If I may be allowed to make a suggestion, I think that Mr. Ghose's statement, which is thoroughly well considered and deserving of great respect, should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons.

No pains should be spared, in my opinion, in your endeavour to inform Parliament and the British press and public of the true nature of this great question.—I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

Richard Garth.

December 8th, 1895.

II.—By Sir J. B. Phear,

Late Chief Justice in Ceylon.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—You have done a great public service by publishing the details of your "interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose upon the above topic. This gentleman, by reason of his near upon thirty years experience in the active and, I may add, eminently successful practice of his profession in the High Court of Calcutta, as well as in the local courts throughout the Presidency of Bengal, is peculiarly entitled to be listened to when he speaks upon the important subject with which the "interview" deals. And apart from this, his English education, his long familiarity and indeed identification with highly cultured English society and its ways of life, and his unquestioned sympathy with and loyalty to British rule in India combine to give especial weight and value to his utterances on behalf of his countrymen in this matter.

It is deplorable to perceive from Mr. Ghose's statement that there still lurks in influential quarters an indisposition to recognise the extreme importance, especially under the circumstances of our rule in India, of keeping the judicial and executive functions, so far as practicable, apart. I had imagined that all question on this point had been set at rest, so far as the expression of authoritative opinion could operate, at least a quarter of a century ago, and that financial and service difficulties alone have hitherto hindered the full attainment of the desired reform.

It fell to me after leaving India, and when largely responsible for the administration of justice in Ceylon, to advise the Government of that colony upon the working of the local courts of justice under a system of mixed functions analogous to that of India; and to indicate with some closeness of examination the serious evils which inevitably result from the judicial inefficiency incidental to such a system, and of which, it may be mentioned, not the least is a vicious use of civil and criminal proceedings, so often supposed by Englishmen to be characteristic of Oriental peoples, but more properly attributable to the infirmity and misunderstood attitude of the courts themselves.

I do not, of course, ask you to burden your columns with material drawn from this source; but may perhaps be allowed to add that the European planters in Ceylon, a very influential portion of the community and deeply interested in the efficiency of the local courts, have recently, as I am informed, pressed the Government for a reform of the judicial system with express reference to the grounds disclosed in this official communication.

The second head of Mr. Ghose's complaint is even more to be regretted than the first. That there should be any such persistent endeavours on the part of any Government of British training to make the Judiciary practically subservient to the Executive as Mr. Ghose represents to have lately been manifested in Bengal, is difficult to believe—not that incentives to such an endeavour are inconceivable, but that to yield to these would be symptomatic of a lower order of statesmanship than one would like to attribute to one of the subordinate Governments of India. There may be and probably are local officials who think that the prestige of the Executive, as they understand it, must be maintained at any cost and at whatever hazard; but all should by this time know that the true strength of the British rule in India consists in the approach which it makes to the unbiassed administration of justice by the civil and criminal courts not merely as between private persons but also between private persons of all classes and the Government; and that the surest way of upholding the prestige of the Executive in the eyes of the people and securing its efficiency is to make it the visible supporter of an independent, impartial and competent judiciary. A step in the opposite direction is but a source of weakness to the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Executive itself. This lesson has been written for us in almost every page of our own history, and I feel pretty confident that Sir Charles Elliott's successor is not one to disregard it.—Yours obediently,

J. B. PHEAR.

Marpool, *December* 18*th*, 1895.

III.—BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

In the December number of INDIA Mr. Manomohan Ghose's views on the crying question of the relations of the judiciary and the executive in India were set forth in the most pointed and lucid manner possible. They constitute a formidable indictment of the Indian and the Home Government. The keenest adversary would not accuse Mr. Ghose of overstating his case. It is to be hoped that the question will be taken up by public opinion in England, where the existing union of judicial and executive functions in India cannot be looked upon without shame and abhorrence. The essential difficulty here is to get Englishmen to understand what is the matter of complaint; but with Mr. Ghose's statement before them, they can have no further excuse for remaining apathetic over the longstanding grievance of their fellow-subjects in India.

There can be no question that on this serious matter of administration the Indian National Congress represents the universal feeling of the country. The demand for the separation of judicial and executive functions has stood on the Congress programme for many years; and the subject has been so completely thrashed out in all its bearings that Mr. Ananda Charlu last year moved the resolution without a speech. It may be well to reproduce the terms of the resolution, so as to show the exact attitude of the Congress to the question:

"That this Congress having till now vainly appealed for many successive years to the Government of India, and also to the Secretary of State, to remove one of the gravest defects in the system of administration and one fraught with incalculable oppression to all classes of people throughout the country, and having noted with satisfaction the admission of the evil by two former Secretaries of State (Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross), and being of opinion that the reform is thoroughly practicable, as has been shown by Messrs. R. C. Dutt, M. M. Ghose, and P. M. Mehta, entreats the Government of India to direct the immediate appointment in each province of a Committee (one half at least of whose members shall be non-official natives of India, qualified by education and experience in the workings of various Courts to deal with the question) to prepare a scheme for the complete separation of all Judicial and Executive functions in their own province with as little additional cost to the State as may be practicable, and the submission of such schemes, with the opinions of the several Governments thereon, at an early date."

There is no difference of independent opinion, in fact, as to the urgent necessity of reform. Mr. Ghose cited telling illustrations from his own experience in Bengal. The records of the Congress debates contain similar examples from the most diverse parts of India. Previous to all experience of the system, it might have been fully anticipated that the results would prove no less unsatisfactory than they have actually done. It is the simplest thing in the world for the unthinking obstructionist to say with the Hon. Mr. Nugent, of the Bombay Legislative Council, that "the present system works very well." As we shall see, this is in a sense true; but that is no reason why the system should not work very much better. The scathing criticism of Mr. Nugent's comfortable remark, which Mr. A. C. Mazoomdar addressed to the Congress at Lahore two years ago, indicates how urgently necessary is the reform demanded:—

"The present system works very well indeed! But very well for whom? That is the question. Yes, it is very well for some person to be able to chase and belabour with impunity a tender boy of eleven years of age for the grave offence of saying 'Good Morning' to a European, and then to have his complaint dismissed because the beating did not leave any mark on his person. It is very well indeed for a Deputy Commissioner to be able to tear off documentary evidence against him from the records of a Court of Justice, and enjoy greater immunity than a Duchess in England. How very well it is to have an unfortunate gentleman tried thrice over for the same alleged offence, because each time the order of discharge failed to recommend itself to the District Magistrate, and then to have him ultimately convicted by a subordinate magistrate. It is of course very well for a settlement officer to be able to go armed with a gun and force open the Zenana of a respectable zemindar, and thence drag him in illness a distance of thirty miles, and after all this to be sure to get the support and sympathies of the district and the divisional authorities. How very well is it for an assistant magistrate to be able to set at naught the order of a Sessions Judge for bail, and keep a poor stamp vendor in jail at his own sweet pleasure; and how supremely well it is for a magistrate to have the fancy to drive quietly through the crowded streets of one of the busiest cities in the country, and finding a slow-moving, heavy-laden cart in his way, to come down and flog the unfortunate driver to the ground, and then have the poor man's complaint compromised in the court of a subordinate magistrate . . . . A Magistrate of Patna has . . . . ruled that the time for cross-examination of witnesses for the prosecution should be always cut down to five minutes."

The vista of petty tyranny opened up by these examples, which are too trifling to get beyond local knowledge, ought to be enough to satisfy independent observers that here is an intolerable grievance demanding immediate and thorough-going reform. Let Englishmen take such cases as these home to themselves, and then say what they think of the system under which they are possible occurrences.

On the face of things, the two functions are gravely incompatible. The Executive officer necessarily keeps his eyes open over the whole field of his jurisdiction, and gathers in all sorts of information on which it is possible for him to lay his hands. Such information must, in the very nature of things, be *ex parte*. It is unsifted. It may be, almost inevitably must be, extremely incomplete. It may be honestly reported, and yet be wholly mistaken. It may also be dishonestly, or carelessly, reported. At best it can be received only as provisional. The Judicial officer, on the other hand, is bound to confine his attention to the evidence laid before him under the rules of procedure. He may not look beyond the evidence and the law on the particular subject. In every case, almost necessarily, he will have before him a considerable mass of information on the point at issue, to which the executive officer has had no access whatever. The two functions are too obviously distinct and incompatible for anything in the nature of serious argument.

If there is one thing more than another in our administration of India on which we pride ourselves,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

if there is one element of our conduct in India of more value to us than another for the stability of our rule, if there is one principle more than another that the people of England would wish to see carried fully into operation in the dependency—it is English justice. Mr. Ghose, one is happy to observe, acknowledges that justice was never better administered in India; that person and property were never more secure; that the blessings of a pure administration are generally appreciated; and that to such appreciation are mainly due the loyalty and contentment of the masses of the people. No doubt what Mr. Ghose says of Bengal is true of the other provinces. But all these facts go to emphasise the fundamental importance of allowing no blots to besmirch the fair face of justice. "I regret," says Mr. Ghose, "to say that the course of justice does not always go evenly when racial considerations are involved. In criminal cases especially the racial element frequently leads to gross miscarriage of justice." The point is mildly and delicately put; but it is a most serious point for all that, and one that will cost us dear unless some fresh spirit of equity be infused into the whole Anglo-Indian administration. Yet, Mr. Ghose concludes, "the cause which more frequently leads to miscarriage of justice is one which it is in the power of the Government or the legislature to rectify if it chooses, and that is the combination of judicial and executive functions." The weighty meaning of these words may be gathered from Mr. Ghose's explanation and from the examples we have cited above from Mr. Mazoomdar. The power of the High Court to call up and revise the record of all criminal cases no doubt exercises a most salutary restraining influence upon the judiciary throughout the country. But the dependence of judges and magistrates on the Executive for promotion and preferment has a disastrous tendency to sap the very foundations of justice; and the increasing tendency of the Executive, even in high places, to bring pressure to bear, directly or indirectly, upon the judiciary, not even excepting the judges of the High Courts, is of the most ominous import.

Why, then, should this obnoxious system not at once go by the board? It is, in fact, a reversion to a bygone stage of development. Originally, the collector of a district united in himself the civil, the criminal, and the fiscal functions. Lord Cornwallis, in 1793, took away the civil functions. In 1833, largely through the exertions of Raja Ram Mohun Roy, revenue work was assigned exclusively to special deputy collectors and assistants. In 1839, the judicial and executive functions of the magistrate-collector were separated; and in 1843 deputy magistrates were created for the relief of the district magistrates. But the baleful union of functions was re-established in 1858; the collector was reinvested with magisterial powers, and the deputy collectors and the deputy magistrates were amalgamated into the subordinate executive service. The urgency of the Congress has been so far successful. One viceroy at least has openly declared his sympathy. Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice in Bengal, has given the reform the weight of his opinion and warm advocacy. Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley, Secretaries of State, both regarded the reform as important. Lord Kimberley declared the system to be "contrary to right and good principle." Yet there it stands to this day, a discredited anachronism in full operation!

What is the reason of such a preposterous state of things? Said Lord Kimberley: "though the proposal is most desirable, yet Government is unable to entertain it, as it would require double the staff at present to do so." In the present state of the Indian finances, the objection of cost stops everything—except scientific frontiers and superannuation allowances. But the financial objection in this case is simply factitious. "As my friend, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., of the Bengal Civil Service, now Commissioner of the Orissa Division, has shown," says Mr. Ghose, "the reform could be carried out without costing an additional rupee to the State." But even if it involved some additional cost, the saving could be effected elsewhere with immense advantage to the country. Sir Richard Garth did not hesitate to say plainly that the principal objection to the reform lay in the apprehension of executive officers that it would lower their prestige. Lord Kimberley, of course, could not accept that view. But Mr. Ghose, on the contrary, declares: "I am convinced, from what I have seen, heard, and read, that Sir Richard Garth was perfectly right in his assertion, and that the financial objection is merely put forward in the present embarrassed state of Indian finances in order to shelve the question." Shall the question be thus ignominiously shelved?

IV.—By J. Dacosta.

The independence of the judicial bench needs no advocacy in this country, seeing that it is universally admitted to be a main factor in the development of England's prosperity and the mainstay of her welfare and greatness. Impartiality in a judge is scarcely possible when influences are exercised from powerful quarters tending to induce him to deliver his judgment otherwise than in accordance with his conscience and his lights. This proposition might seem a truism. But it acquires great significance in the light of the lamentable facts which Mr. Manomohan Ghose, of the Calcutta Bar, mentioned in his interview with a representative of this journal in November last, and in his address at a meeting of the East India Association in December, when he invited his audience to discuss the subject of judicial independence in India. The facts narrated by Mr. Ghose brought to light the existence of a corrupt system under which the miscarriage of justice in India, owing to the interference of the Executive in the administration of the law, and the undue pressure exercised over judges and magistrates, is of daily occurrence. Mr. Ghose's *exposé* of the manner in which, after a hundred years of British rule in India, justice is dispensed in that country, must cause deep disappointment and sorrow to all who cherished the delusion that the principles of fairness and the high standard of morality which distinguish our tribunals at home were upheld in the law established by us in our Indian Empire.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The abuses and gross irregularities denounced by Mr. Ghose are, of course, not revelations, for they must be known to all Englishmen who have resided in India out of the Presidency towns, and also to those at home who have sought information as to how our Indian administration is conducted. Flagrant cases of injustice, oppression, and spoliation have, on appeal from our Indian courts, been heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and been reported in the home papers, especially in law publications, and the *Law Magazine and Review* has in recent years[1] contained articles fully in unison with all that Mr. Ghose said at the interview and the meeting mentioned above. Mr. Ghose, on those occasions, did not confine himself to denunciation. He suggested a remedy for much of the evil exposed by him, by saying that magistrates of the second and third classes would in a great measure be freed from the restraint which prevents them from pronouncing decisions in accordance with their judgment and conscience if the Executive officer of the district (who is also the Revenue collector) were divested of the appellate and revisional powers which he exercises over the magistrates in question, and if those powers were vested in the District Judge who is directly subordinate to the High Court. Mr. Ghose has practiced with remarkable success for nearly thirty years as a barrister of the High Court of Bengal, and his opinion on matters connected with his profession is therefore entitled to great respect. It is gratifying, moreover, to find that the reform suggested by him met with the entire approval of Sir Lepel Griffin, who presided at the aforesaid meeting, and whose experience and successful career in the Indian Civil Service likewise entitle his opinion on matters of Indian administration to the respect and attention of the public. The suggested reform seems well calculated, by weakening the Executive officer's power of interference, to strengthen the judicial independence of the magistrates who are now subordinate to him. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the Executive officer, in using his power of interference, acts under the immediate inspiration of the Government, and that if his utility to the Executive in that direction were diminished, the Government would find no difficulty in discovering or creating some other channel through which to control the decisions of the magistrates whom the proposed reform might liberate. The evil springs from a higher source than the action of the Indian officials mentioned by Mr. Ghose. The Governor-General in Council himself acts under the control of the Secretary of State, and what prospect can there be of independence being secured to the Judicial Bench so long as the Executive powerfully contends against such independence, with the knowledge and sanction of that Crown Minister who, while he admits the necessity of reform in the interests of justice, pleads financial difficulties as a bar to it and, at the same time, squanders millions of Indian revenue every year in waging unprovoked and unsuccessful wars of conquest?

[1] May and August, 1892; February and November, 1892 and 1894; and February, 1895. See also the reports of the proceedings of the Indian National Congress *passim*.

THE BETRAYAL OF KAFIRISTAN.

BY AN EX-DIPLOMATIST.

There can be no doubt that every member of the present and last Government is personally sorry for the mistake that has been made in "handing over" the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush to the tender mercies of the Afghans. Still no steps are taken to undo the great wrong that has been committed, and that will brand England for ever in history. There is no difficulty in pointing out to the Amír that we can only make over to him the external relations of Kafiristan, in case that country, or rather its retired and practically lost tribes, ever have any, say, with Russia, he occupying towards Kafiristan the position which we hold towards the independent tribes of Bajaur, that of controlling their external relations without any interference in their internal affairs. Kafiristan has never formed part of Afghanistan. It is also not on any possible strategical or military line. Its people are by race, religion, and language entirely different from the Afghans, against whom they have defended their liberty and lives for 1,000 years, before England took for herself the Amír's kindred, the Pathans of Bajaur, etc., that really belong to the Amír, and gave him in return, under the Durand treaty, what was not ours to give, the heterogeneous tribes of Kafiristan. If this interpretation of the Durand treaty is impossible, it would suffice plainly to tell the Amír, who avowedly values the friendship of the British people so much more highly than that of the Indian Government, that we could never have meant, as an anti-slavery nation, to "hand over" for extermination and enslavement our kith and kin, our good friends, "the brethren of the Europeans," the white men of the Hindu Kush. Nor can there ever be a sincere and lasting friendship between England and a slave-raiding nation; much less can England allow such a nation to be officially or diplomatically represented in this country. Why this harmless concession has not been made to the Amír in return for sparing Kafiristan when we go out of our way to call his an "independent Government" passes our comprehension, for the Amír would, of course, be represented in London by an Afghan, who could give us more insight into Afghan feelings and politics than a host of Pynes and Martins, or even Durands, could ever do. Reverting to the now progressing inroads on Kafiristan from south, north and west, we have not only helped on this shameful *battue* of practically defenceless men by our subsidies of money and of the most modern weapons of destruction: we have not only shown the Afghans how to construct a military road into the Kafir mountain recesses when we demarcated the Asmar boundary, but we have also legalised their slavery proceedings, even beyond the authority of a treaty that, like a dark crime, is still kept a secret from Parliament and the public, which should insist on its publication. We have allowed the Amír to proclaim a Jihád, or "holy war," against the Hindu Kush Kafirs by the same man, the Mulla of Huda, Nizamuddin, who proclaimed one against the British in Swat, Bunair, and Chagarzai. Now every captive taken in such a war is lawfully a slave according to Muham-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

madan law, and so it is the special shame of England to have legalised what, even in the Muhammadan religion, is a wrong generally. We may, however, add that the Amír has given the Kafirs the option between becoming Muhammadans and being exterminated or enslaved. If the Kafirs are what they were in 1866, when they preferred burning themselves to death rather than become Muhammadans, they will not avail themselves of the chance of saving their bare lives, for we very much doubt, with the existence of so many Muhammadan slaves in Afghanistan, whether much of their liberty or property would be left to them in any case. Above all, do the Church Missionary Society deserve to be congratulated on having paved the way for the adoption of Muhammadanism, as usually happens with Christian missions among heathens? The Kafirs received the agents of that society with hospitality, and even with enthusiasm, and it is disgraceful that they should now be left in the lurch, even if it be not true that in the interior of Kafiristan or among the Kafirs there still exist vestiges of an ancient Christianity. A Nero would melt at the fate in store for the Kafirs, and of which even extermination or enslavement is not the worst feature. We fear, however, that there is as much hypocrisy in the religious world as there is a want of humanity, of sagacity, and of the required special knowledge among ministers, who, to avoid trouble or the study of questions committed to them, invent the words "prestige" and "policy" in order to conceal their ignorance and incapacity. At the same time, there can be little doubt that there is a policy in "making over" Kafiristan to the Amír, as there was in inventing the Kashmir suzerainty for Chitral and then using it practically to annex Kashmir, as also its present dependencies, for ourselves. Already in August last the *Standard* was let into the secret. It said: "Under the terms of the recent agreement with the Amír Abdur Rahman, Kafiristan is regarded as lying outside the immediate sphere of British influence, and should the Amír resolve to extend his power in this direction, there will be nothing to hinder him beyond physical obstacles to the advance of his troops. Yet it is impossible not to feel some regret at the fate which would seem to be in store for the Kafirs. Their forcible conversion to Islam would entail much unmerited suffering; and would, at the same time, obliterate the last traces of a civilisation, such as it is, and of a social system which, if there is not very much to admire in it, presents many features of extreme interest to the student." On the 14th September following, the *Standard* allowed a little more of "the policy" to be perceived. There it would seem to hint at the desirability of the Amír of Afghanistan being reduced to the dependent condition of Kashmir, a feudatory who is not subsidised, but who bought its "independence" (see Treaty of 1846). "Kashmir is controlled much more completely and effectually than Afghanistan." Indeed, as "England can command the experience of experts like the Under-Secretary of State, who can boast of a personal acquaintance even with the more obscure details of *any problem that may require solution*" (the italics are ours), he may be able to reduce the Afghan circle by reducing it to the proportions of Kashmir. "In fact," the evidently inspired writer goes on to say, "Kashmir" (with which, *nota bene*, Afghanistan is significantly compared) "stands in the same relation to the British Government as Bokhara or Khiva to the Government of the Czar." If so, then woe to Afghanistan, for the Bokhara Prince has asked to be relieved of all sovereignty and to retire on a pension to Europe, though not to Dorchester House. The special disgrace of the matter consists in the fact that, in the face of the avowed policy of Viceroys, and Parliaments, and Secretaries of State, the inner "policy," that was represented at one end by the Durand at the Foreign Office and at the other by his brother the Durand at Gilghit (with Dr. Robertson and Captain Younghusband to inspire Mr. Curzon and Lord Roberts), has simply had it all its own way, whether it be with Hunza-Nagyr, Chilás or Chitral, or now, we fear, with unhappy Kafiristan. What, also, could exceed the mismanagement of a recent princely visit which was to strengthen the existing bonds with an Oriental State? "Such are the men that cause war between two nations," was the remark of a prince regarding the man who was appointed to pamper and bully him alternately in this country. *Absit omen!*

THE INDISCRETIONS OF SIR C. ELLIOTT.

BY A. NUNDY.
Secretary to the Gorakhpur Congress Committee.

The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is a much abused man, but he deserves credit for the courage of his opinions. He may be wrong-headed, he may be above seeing that sometimes what he says must sound ridiculous to others, or that it may not be politic to give expression in public to some of his private opinions. But he frankly lays bare his mind, regardless of consequences. To some extent, therefore, we are under an obligation to Sir C. Elliott. His latest utterance is, however, too startling. At a farewell dinner given to him in Calcutta by the Civil Service he is reported by the correspondent of the *Times* to have "pronounced against the principle of the public censure of officials." "It obtained," he added, "nowhere else but in India where it was the more unnecessary because of the efficiency of the Civil Service. It lowered the prestige of the Service and should therefore be avoided." Sir C. Elliott raises a good many questions. Is it true that nowhere but in India officials are subject to criticism? Is the Civil Service really as efficient as he would have us believe? However efficient a Service may be, is it desirable that it should not be liable to criticism? Does a Service necessarily lose in prestige if its official acts are criticised by the public? No responsible politician in England, if he had any regard for his reputation, would ever think of propounding such startling propositions.

Sir Charles Elliott seems to have a special facility for getting into awkward positions, from which the Viceroy or the Secretary of State has to extricate him as best they may. If the feat is impossible, they are compelled to throw him over. I am re-

CC-0.Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

minded of an incident which occurred five years ago when the National Congress was holding its meetings in Calcutta. It was brought to the notice of the Subjects Committee that some members of Sir C. Elliott's household had expressed a desire to be present at the Congress. The Committee decided, as a matter of courtesy, to send them tickets of admission, and the tickets were accordingly sent. What then happened might have been dismissed as merely entertaining, but that it was really serious in its consequences. The tickets might have been accepted by those to whom they were sent, who could have attended the Congress, or a note acknowledging the receipt of the tickets might have been sent without the recipients gracing the Congress with their presence. But Sir C. Elliott thought this a good opportunity to administer a snub to the Congress. The day after the tickets had been sent a notification appeared in the Calcutta newspapers which ran thus:—

"NOTICE.

"THE CONGRESS.—The Bengal Government having learnt that tickets of admission to the visitors' enclosure in the Congress pavilion have been sent to various Government officers, has issued a circular to all secretaries and heads of departments subordinate to it pointing out that under the orders of the Government of India the presence of Government officials even as visitors at such meetings is not advisable, and that their taking part in the proceedings of any such meetings is absolutely prohibited."

This was not all. The recipients of the tickets returned the tickets with the following letter, which will speak for itself:—

"Belvedere, 26th December, 1890.

"Dear Sir,—In returning herewith the seven cards of admission to the visitors' enclosure of the Congress Pavilion, which were kindly sent by you to my address yesterday afternoon, I am desired to say that the Lieutenant-Governor and the members of the household could not possibly avail themselves of these tickets, since the orders of the Government of India definitely prohibit the presence of Government officials at such meetings.—Yours faithfully,

"P. C. LYON, Private Secretary.

"To J. GHOSAL, Esq.,
"Sec., Congress Reception Committee."

The reader will, no doubt, have been struck by the difference between the terms of the orders of the Government of India as given in the Notification and in the letter to the Secretary of the Congress Committee, for both of which Sir C. Elliott was responsible. In one, the presence of Government officials as visitors is said to be not advisable while their taking part in the proceedings is prohibited. In the other, even the presence of such officials is definitely prohibited. The Subjects Committee, amongst whom were then present Messrs. W. S. Caine, C. E. Schwann, and George Yule, decided to bring the matter before the Congress, and appeal to the Viceroy. Mr. George Yule delivered a vigorous and stirring speech, and proposed the following resolution:

"That this Congress, having observed with surprise a notice, apparently official, in various Calcutta newspapers which runs as follows (here the above Notification is quoted), and having also considered a letter addressed by the Private Secretary of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal to the Secretary of the Reception Committee (here the above letter is quoted), authorises and instructs its President to draw the attention of His Excellency the Viceroy to the declaration contained in these papers, that Government servants are prohibited from attending any meetings of this Congress, even as spectators, and to enquire most respectfully whether His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal has, or has not, correctly interpreted the orders of the Government of India."

This Resolution was duly forwarded by Mr. P. M. Mehta, the President of the Congress, to the Viceroy who, it is an open secret, at once consulted the Secretary of State for India, and, Mr. Mehta having in the meantime left Calcutta, sent the following reply to Mr. A. O. Hume:

"19th January, 1891.

"Dear Sir,—I am authorised by His Excellency to say that Mr. Lyon's letter of December 26th, in which it was stated that the orders of the Government of India definitely prohibit the presence of Government officials at such meetings, and the circular in which that letter was communicated to the heads of departments under the Bengal Government, were issued under a misapprehension as to the purport of the orders of the Government of India, that the letter in question went beyond those orders, and an amended circular, in which it was pointed out that the expression 'absolute prohibition' had reference only to the participation of Government officials in the proceedings of a political meeting, was subsequently issued by the Bengal Government to the heads of Departments;"

Then the letter added:

"The movement is regarded as one of those which in the words of the circular (referring to the Government of India circular of March 18th, 1890) are perfectly legitimate in themselves and which private persons are free to promote, but from participation in which Government officials are, for the reasons specified in the orders, necessarily debarred. The Government of India recognises that the Congress movement is regarded as representing in India what in Europe would be called the more advanced Liberal party, as distinguished from the great body of Conservative opinion which meets side by side with it.

"(Signed) P. C. ARDAGH, Private Secretary."

Sir C. Elliott was certainly thrown over in this instance by his official superiors, and I doubt not that, if in regard to his latest pronouncement as to the impropriety of Government officials being subjected to public criticism, the opinions of the Viceroy or the Secretary of State could be elicited, it would be found that these authorities would repudiate, or at least modify to a great extent, what was said by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

BRITISH OPINIONS ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE.

The current number of INDIA contains the report of an interesting interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose on the relations between the Indian Judiciary and the Indian Executive. Mr. Ghose, now in England on a short holiday, is one of the leaders of the bar at Calcutta, and was the first native of India called to the English bar. He readily acknowledges the purity with which justice is administered throughout India, and the respect in which its administration is held. But he points out that some high officers of the Indian Government, notably Sir Charles Elliott, have shown a dangerous tendency to interfere with judicial independence. Sir Charles has not concealed his opinion that in India magistrates and judges ought to be for all purposes regarded as members of the Executive. A more perilous doctrine it would be difficult to conceive. As Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir Charles

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Elliott was responsible for a Bill limiting the right of trial by jury which Lord Kimberley compelled him to withdraw. It may be necessary that in India, as here, magistrates should act in two capacities, should at one time direct the police in putting down a riot, and at another time sit to try rioters. But such a system should be restricted, and not extended. Mr. Ghose cites cases in which native magistrates have been rebuked by British Commissioners for acquitting prisoners, in one instance where the prosecutor actually admitted that the charge was untrue. The judges of the High Courts, though nominally holding office at the pleasure of the Crown are, Mr. Ghose acknowledges, practically independent, though even they have come into collision with the Executive. The district judges are liable to Executive comment, and the native magistrates appear to be as subordinate as policemen. The attention of Parliament might usefully be drawn to the whole subject.—*Daily News*, December 2nd.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose was closely followed by his audience at the East India Society's rooms yesterday, as he put before them in a singularly lucid and dispassionate speech the case for the separation of the executive and judicial functions in India. His charges were that the subordinate magistrates were subjected to constant pressure from the district magistrates—who are also executive officers; that the constant reversal by judges of the High Court of sentences made under this pressure amounted to a scandal, and that the judges of the High Court themselves were by no means free from executive censure and criticism. Mr. Ghose confined himself to his own knowledge of what was happening in the Bengal Presidency, though this thoroughly bad and mischievous system is at work throughout India, except in the Presidency towns. There was a remarkable consensus of opinion in the discussion which followed. Mr. Bhownaggree, M.P., speaking from personal experience, pleaded strongly for the freedom of the judiciary. Sir Roland Wilson, who was Reader in Indian law at Cambridge for thirteen years, spoke of the utter impossibility of training civil servants for two careers in the short time allowed. Several native speakers added their testimony. And finally Sir Lepel Griffin, who was in the chair, speaking as one who had held high office in India, declared in favour of Mr. Ghose's proposal. It is a pity that Lord George Hamilton was not there, for the great weight of Anglo-Indian opinion is still dead against a most necessary reform.—*Daily Chronicle*, December 4th.

TORIES AND THE COTTON DUTIES.

The Secretary of State for India will receive to-morrow an important deputation from Lancashire on the subject of the Indian cotton duties, and the Prime Minister will receive one on the subject of the British beer duties. Lord George Hamilton's position is not a pleasant one. But for that he has himself to thank. His letter to the Tory candidate for the Accrington Division, just before the polling in that constituency, is probably without a parallel in the case of a Cabinet Minister charged with the interests of a vast community. In refusing an invitation to speak at Accrington against Sir Joseph Lesse, Lord George declared that his opinions had been expressed in the House of Commons four months before, and that they remained quite unchanged. Those opinions were that the duties on the importation of cotton goods into India were not required by the condition of Indian finance, that they were a tax upon Lancashire for the benefit of India, that India was supported by the British taxpayer, that they were demanded for protective purposes by the millowners of Calcutta and Bombay, and that Sir Henry Fowler, in consenting to them, had been made the tool of Indian Protectionists. He added that Lord Salisbury, who had been Indian Secretary, agreed with him in every particular. When Lord George Hamilton made this astounding deliverance he was not acquainted, otherwise than through Sir Henry Fowler's speech, with the views of the Indian Government. But when he wrote his letter he was Secretary of State, and must have known them very well. "My appointment," he further told his correspondent, "ought to do you good," or words to that effect. It did the Tory candidate no good, because Sir Joseph Lesse was returned. It did Lancashire no good, for the duties remain as before. It certainly did India no good, and we really cannot suggest the name of any class, or of any person, to whom it did good, except Lord George Hamilton himself. Even Lord George Hamilton must learn something in office. He would, we presume, no longer contend that the expenses of Indian administration, including his own salary, were defrayed from the Imperial Exchequer, or that the cotton duties were paid by the Lancashire producer and not by the Indian consumer. A man with a more sensitive conscience would have refused to hold office an hour after discovering that the duties could not be repealed. He may try to put the deputation off with a promise to modify the duties when they can be shown to operate unfairly against the English manufacturers. But his visitors, if they know their business, will not allow him to wriggle out quite so easily. Of course, the duties must be altered if they are protective. The principles of British finance require it, and Sir Henry Fowler gave a distinct pledge that, if necessary, they would be. But that did not satisfy Lord George Hamilton and his friends. They voted for turning out the late Government rather than submit to the duties, and Lord George has declared, on his official authority as Secretary of State for India, that while they oppress Lancashire India does not require them. They are straightforward people in Lancashire, and they do not understand this kind of thing at all. With Sir Henry Fowler they knew where they were. He and his colleagues risked the loss of the Lancashire vote because they considered themselves imperatively bound to restore the financial equilibrium of India. At the same time, Sir Henry Fowler insisted, against the strenuous remonstrances of the Indian Government, upon a countervailing excise to prevent English goods from being handicapped in the Indian market. Now that is a plain and intelligible policy. Anybody can understand it, whether he agrees with it or not. What is the policy of Lord George Hamilton, with whom Lord

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Salisbury concurs? Both in and out of office he has denounced the duties altogether.—*Daily News*, December 10th.

The Lancashire deputation had its interview yesterday with Lord George Hamilton, and begged that the Indian import duties on cotton might be repealed, or that at least their sting might be drawn. We hope Lancashire will carefully study the answer. If it tells us nothing about the duties, it tells us everything about Lord George Hamilton. In just eleven months he has finished such a portrait of himself as cynics like to draw of the typical shifty politician. On February 21st Lord George Hamilton told the House of Commons what he then thought of these duties. First, "the tax was an unfair tax as far as Lancashire was concerned." Secondly, its imposition was "dangerous to the stability of our government in India." Thirdly, it was a tax in which the protective element could not possibly be suppressed by any countervailing duty of Indian Excise. "For his part, he disbelieved altogether in the efficacy of an Excise duty for the purpose." Finally, the voice of India was not in favour of the tax. He ridiculed the notion of being influenced by the voice of Bombay. "If they wanted to hear the voice of India, Bombay and Calcutta were not the places where they could hear it. Those Europeanised cities did not represent India." That is the Lord George Hamilton of February 21st. And here is the Lord George Hamilton of yesterday afternoon. "You have alluded," he told the deputation, "to the fact that the Indian Government have unduly consulted the Bombay Chamber of Commerce and merchants upon their legislation. But," he added, "you must recollect that the cotton merchants at Bombay were the only persons whom the Indian Government could consult on a question of that kind." Is it an offence to consult Bombay in February and a piece of political sagacity to consult her in December? If Bombay and Calcutta were the last places where the voice of India was to be heard last winter, how comes Bombay to be the only place where the voice of India has been audible this autumn? But the year has made even greater changes than this in Lord George Hamilton. In February he flatly denied the necessity of imposing the duties. Now, he says, "that financial exigency exists. It was for the purpose of establishing an equilibrium in Indian finance that these duties were imposed." And yet he believes that "since they were imposed the position of Indian finance has slightly improved." So that, while there was no necessity for the duties when Indian finance was at its worst, there is a necessity for them when its condition has improved. The desperate remedy which he scouted when the disease was at its worst he gravely declares to be necessary when the violence of the disease is abating. Last February he was all compassion for Lancashire. He denounced "the unwisdom and unfairness of putting the whole burden of sustaining the solvency of the Indian Government upon the shoulders of an already very depressed industry." The unwisdom and unfairness are quite forgotten now. It is simply "the financial exigency exists." In fact, vice has been turned into virtue when the door has been converted from a Liberal into a Conservative Government. The act that was unjust to Lancashire and perilous for India when it was sanctioned by Sir Henry Fowler becomes an inevitable concession to "financial exigency" when the assent is that of Lord George Hamilton. There is a still worse side to the matter. At the general election Lord George Hamilton sought to gain Lancashire votes by giving it to be understood that as Secretary for India he would be willing and able to carry out the policy which he advocated as an Opposition speaker. On February 21st he told the House of Commons that his view of the duties was shared by Lord Salisbury. Lord Salisbury too, it was given to be understood, believed that the duties inflicted injustice on Lancashire and danger on India, and that the injustice could not be avoided by any countervailing duty of Excise. When the general election came on, Lord George Hamilton, already in full power over India, bade Lancashire think what this speech meant and vote accordingly, "My views on the extra duties," he wrote, in a letter to be used in the Unionist canvass at Accrington, "are stated in a speech of mine I made this spring in the House of Commons, and my appointment to India ought in consequence to help in your election." Lancashire voters were to believe that if they kept the new Secretary at the India Office he and the Premier, whose support he declared that he had, would abandon all attempts to patch up the injustice by means of countervailing duties, in whose efficacy he "disbelieved altogether;" they would relieve the Indian Government from the "danger" which it had incurred, disregarding the voice of "those Europeanised cities," Calcutta and Bombay, and would repair "the unwisdom and injustice of putting the whole burden of sustaining the solvency of the Indian Government upon the shoulders of an already very depressed industry." What could this mean but immediate and total repeal? Lord George Hamilton had vehemently presented the case for repeal, and he told Lancashire to remember that fact. Since presenting it he had passed from the position of advocate to that of judge, and he told Lancashire to remember that fact too, and for her own sake to keep him on the bench. Imagine the effect that would have been exercised on the Lancashire elections if he had written to Accrington, not what he did write last July, but what he said yesterday—if the Unionist candidates had had nothing better to paper the walls with than "Unfortunately a financial exigency for the Indian import duties exists," and "I say very frankly to you that I do not believe, even if it were possible for us and in our power to repeal these cotton duties, that it would at once bring to you all the prosperity which you anticipate." That would have been honourable, whether wise or not. But it would have been unprofitable, and it was not done. With the active concurrence of almost every Unionist candidate for the county, and the quiet connivance of men reputed so fastidious as Mr. Arthur Balfour himself, Lancashire was induced to part with her political goods on grossly false pretences. The whole shifty business is exposed now, and it offers one of the most ignoble spectacles of political misconduct that has been seen in this country for many years.—*Manchester Guardian*, December 12th.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

ELEVENTH SESSION.

MEETINGS AT POONA.

Poona, Dec. 27.

The Tenth Indian National Congress opened here to-day with much enthusiasm, under the Presidency of Surendra Nath Banerji. Sixteen hundred delegates attended, as well as about 4,000 visitors from various parts of India.

The Chairman of the Reception Committee said that the Congress had completed its first cycle of ten years, and entered upon a second cycle with greater strength, authority, and force, and could not be ignored.

The President's Address was of an exhaustive character. The Congress, he said, now demanded modest reforms in the Administration leading to the greater happiness and contentment of the people. The aim of the Congress was to assist the Government, not to revolutionise it. The Administration needed liberalising and placing on broader foundations. He emphasised the necessity for holding competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in England and India. He hoped that the English people would soon return Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to Parliament. He regretted that the scope of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure now sitting in London did not include the question of the policy regulating expenditure so far as it was productive of no good to the country. —*Reuter.*

Poona, Dec. 28.

At to-day's sitting of the Indian National Congress the opinion was strongly expressed that no good would come from the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, of which Lord Welby is chairman, unless the policy regulating the expenditure was inquired into; and, further, that the proceedings of the Commission should be conducted with open doors. The real source of financial embarrassment, it was held, was the "appalling Military and Home Charges," and not exchange. This, it was declared, had now been acknowledged by expert authorities.

The subject of the proposed legislation to restrict the finality of jury verdicts was next discussed. It was affirmed that the projected retrograde changes in a jury system which worked well were viewed with alarm and distrust, and that the popular voice was dead against any such modification.

Dealing with another subject, the Congress declared that the extensive engagement of Indians in the higher offices in the Government service was not possible unless effect were given to the House of Commons' Resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations in India and England.

The occupation of Chitral was condemned as the outcome of an unjustifiable frontier policy overriding Parliamentary statute, and it was maintained that Indian interests demanded that, where expenses were incurred in execution of the Imperial policy of Great Britain, the Imperial Exchequer should bear a part thereof.

The sittings of the Congress are to conclude on Monday.—*Reuter.*

CONFERENCE OF INDIANS IN ENGLAND.

On Saturday, December 28th, a number of Indians met in conference, at Montagu Mansions, Bloomsbury. The meeting discussed the following resolution:—"That this conference considers the reform and expansion of the supreme and local legislative councils by the admission of a considerable proportion of elected members, and the creation of similar councils in the Punjab and Central Provinces as absolutely essential; and holds that all Budgets should be referred to these councils for adoption." Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who presided, said they were to consider a subject of very great importance, which, as British subjects, ought to be specially interesting to them. He hoped the matter would be calmly considered. (Cheers.) Mr. M. A. Ghani, in moving the resolution, expressed his pleasure at seeing Indians and Englishmen gathered together for the consideration of this deeply interesting question. (Cheers.) At present the Indian subjects of the Queen had not the slightest hand in the administration of the affairs of their own country. They who were born in that country were claiming, if not a predominant, at least an equal share in its government. At present they had not a shadow of anything like self-government. Giving as reasons why there should be a reform in the election of councils, Mr. Ghani went on to say that if the laws were passed in the country with the consent of its people, they would have no cause to complain of those laws. If the Government were in touch with the feelings and desires of the people of India, its position would be strengthened. He asked the meeting why the authorities should not make use of the administrative ability which existed in India, instead of importing it all at a great expense. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Balfour had stated that India was conquered by the sword and would be held by the sword. But it was held by the sword of India, for where would the British power have been during the Mutiny had it not been for the splendid loyalty of some of the India peoples? (Cheers.) They owed England a great debt of gratitude for the spread of Western ideas. They did not want a parliament for India. All they wanted was a fair share in the selection of members for the Legislative Councils, which should have consultative and not dictative or executive functions. (Cheers.)—Mr. Ghaswalla seconded the resolution. He pointed out that the elective principle in government was not unknown in India, as it had existed from time immemorial in the village communities, and was even now working well in some of their municipalities. The Anglo-Indians were the real obstacles to reform. He appealed to the people of Great Britain to come to the assistance of their Indian fellow-subjects, and help them to obtain some of the blessings of self-government which had done so much for Englishmen. (Cheers.)—After further discussion the resolution was carried.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JANUARY, 1896.

THE ELEVENTH CONGRESS.

"OF all the many acts of injustice which have "marked the conduct of the Government of India of "late years, there is," wrote Sir Richard Garth last spring, "none in my opinion which can at all com- "pare with their insolent treatment of the Indian "National Congress. There is no subject, I con- "sider, upon which the English press and the "English public have been so cruelly and per- "sistently misled by the Government party." Sir Richard Garth wrote these words neither as an ignorant amateur nor as a Radical revolutionary. As Chief Justice in Bengal he had ample opportunities of estimating the value of the Indian National Congress while, as regards the general direction of his political sympathies, he has declared himself to be at least as strong a Tory as the late Sir George Chesney. Of that departed worthy we need only say that his invective provoked from Sir Richard Garth a rejoinder as complete as the most ardent supporter of the Congress could wish. It was said of the Congress by ignorant or malicious detractors that it represented a class apart from the people of India, and that its proceedings were mischievous where they were not merely silly. Sir Richard Garth, on the contrary, proved, what everybody who had studied the facts knows perfectly well, that while the Congress is courageous, patriotic and loyal in its aims, it is thoroughly representative in its composition. Sir Richard Garth examined in particular the statistics relating to the Congress held at Allahabad in 1888. The delegates numbered 1,248, and they were directly chosen by more than three millions of constituents. "The constitu- "tion of this important body was thoroughly repre- "sentative; it consisted of Princes, Rajas, Nawabs, "fifty-four members of noble families, members of "Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and com- "missioners of municipalities, fellows of universi- "ties, members of local boards, and professional "men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, "journalists, landed proprietors, shopkeepers, "clergymen, priests, professors of colleges, Zemin- "dars, and others." While the Congress delegates were thus drawn from all ranks and professions they were no less representative of the varied religions of the Indian people. Muhammadans and Hindus, Jains and Christians met together in common assembly to formulate the wishes of a people who, whatever may be their differences of race or creed, are at least united by a common interest in good government and national prosperity. Since 1888 the Congress has become not less but more completely representative of the Indian people. Its influence and its activity are steadily growing, and there are grounds for believing that the attitude of individual officials towards it is becoming more sane. "It "seems to me," wrote Sir Richard Garth in the article from which we have quoted, "that, so far "from being in any way objectionable, the Congress "affords an open, honest and loyal means of making "the views and wishes of the most intelligent section "of the Indian people known to the Government. "We want no secret societies either here or in "India." Sir W. W. Hunter spoke to the same effect last November. The Congress, as he truly said, is essentially the child of British rule, the product of our schools and universities. We have created and fostered the aspirations which animate the Congress, and it would be both churlish and unwise to refuse now to those aspirations both our sympathy and our respectful consideration.

We have not yet before us a full report of the eleventh Congress, which met at Poona on December 27th. The president, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji, is, as the *Indian Spectator* says, nothing if not a popular leader, a politician of undoubted sincerity and zeal, and a brilliant and persuasive orator. Reuter's telegram, which speaks erroneously of the Poona Congress as the tenth, instead of the eleventh, says that sixteen hundred delegates attended on the opening day, and that there were some four thousand visitors as well. These figures are in themselves

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

significant proof of the vitality of the Congress movement. It has, as the chairman of the reception committee said, completed its first cycle of ten years, and entered upon a second cycle with increased strength and authority. It is to be regretted that the preparations for the Congress were somewhat disturbed by differences of opinion between those of its supporters who are, and those who are not, advocates of social reform. For some years it has been the custom of the Congress to extend its hospitality to the Social Conference. The Congress building has been placed at the disposal of the Conference either on the day following the meetings of the Congress or, when a Sunday has intervened, in the midst of them. On the present occasion some opposition was offered at Poona to this customary arrangement, and a dispute ensued which, although its consequences will, we trust, be neither serious nor lasting, all British sympathisers with the Congress must deeply deplore. Some days ago it was announced that the leaders of the Social Conference had, in view of these differences, decided not to ask on the present occasion for the loan of the Congress building. We are not, at the time of writing, aware whether this decision was final. But, if it was, we trust that circumstances will never again arise in which it may seem to be expedient. It may be doubted whether any single thing could be more detrimental to the Congress than the growth of a belief that its supporters were for the most part opposed to social reform. Undoubtedly they are not. The opinions of the majority are all the other way, and the recent dispute was, to a great extent, there can be little doubt, personal in its origin. But it should not be repeated. Even the appearance of hostility to social reform, or of competition between the National Congress and the Social Conference, gives cause to the enemy to blaspheme. We trust that the harmony of the Poona Congress will not have been disturbed, nor its influence diminished, by any circumstances arising out of what seems to have been really a local and personal dispute. Nothing, certainly, can impair the intrinsic importance of the subjects with which the Congress was invited to deal nor of the wishes to which it may be expected to give utterance. The group of questions connected with Indian Finance, the cotton duties, the Royal Commission and trans-frontier aggression are hardly more grave than questions relating to freedom of voting in the Legislative Councils, to the rules in respect of interpellation and discussion on the budget, to the new punitive police legislation, or to the proposed restrictions on the finality of juries' verdicts. Upon these matters as well as others the Congress will, before its meetings terminate, put forward representative opinions that will merit the attention of all who are concerned for the welfare of India.

THE GREAT MOGUL.[1]

Dr. Holden, who dates from the Lick Observatory, Mount Hamilton, tells us that this charming and useful volume is the result of his reading in the original memoirs of the native historians of India and in the accounts of early ambassadors and travellers to the court of the Great Moguls, simply to while away the spare hours of a long and harassing winter. It was a fortunate chance. He found that, as judged by these memoirs and accounts, the representations of the personages in question in the ordinary books of reference were inadequate and frequently incorrect. By-and-by there came into his hands a collection of miniatures of the Mogul Emperors, some of which are copied in this volume and add largely to its value and interest. The natural consequence was to piece together representative extracts, with a running commentary of criticism. Hence the volume is in no sense a history of the three centuries from Tamerlane, but a free and easy companion volume of illustration, which is at the same time sufficiently complete to stand by itself. It is just the kind of book that is most likely to attract fresh students to the careers of the Mogul Emperors, and to the later history of India.

To most people, no doubt, the Mogul period is little more than a name; "its impulses are alien, its note is foreign, and its history seems remote." There remains, however, a fundamental interest in tracing the changes of feeling that came over the great sovereigns during those three eventful centuries, and the alterations worked out in the condition of their subjects. The personal characteristics of the great rulers are perennially attractive to historical students, and it is to these that Dr. Holden directs his main attention. The comparisons he indicates, from time to time, between the kings and the peoples of the East and the West, are in the highest degree interesting and instructive. "The writings of Oriental biographers," he says truly enough, "require to be worked over into a new shape before they are acceptable to Western readers." The great thing is to gain the ear and the eye of the Western public for serious consideration of the historical development of the great Indian dependency.

Dr. Holden commences with Tamerlane the Great, whose career at once furnishes a test of his historical sympathy and critical acumen. He certainly stands the test with remarkable steadfastness. To illustrate the position of Timur, he quotes from the friar De Rubruquis, whom Saint Louis of France sent on an embassy to the Grand Khan of Tartary just after the middle point of the thirteenth century, more than a hundred years before the characteristic activity of Timur. "What is most surprising," he observes, "they met with Nestorian and Jacobite priests in numbers; with fugitive Russians, Greeks, Hungarians, Muhammadans, in plenty; a Knight Templar, a French goldsmith, William Bouchier, of Paris, and his wife, 'a woman from Metz in Lorraine,' and even a strayed Englishman." This, he remarks, affords

[1] "The Mogul Emperors of Hindustan, A.D. 1398 to A.D. 1707." By Edward S. Holden, LL.D. (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co. 10s. 6d.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

an explanation of the variety of arts known in Samarcand in the reign of Batu, the grandson of Chengiz-Khan:

"The tolerance of Chengiz and his sons had ceased under Timur, and the Muslim *mollahs* ruled in all religious matters. But the arts of the architect, the goldsmith, the armourer, the weaver, had already been transplanted to these wilds from Europe, from China, from Africa, from Arabia, from Persia. Astronomy, mathematics, poetry, learning of a sort, were cultivated, and the field was prepared for that remarkable advance in some of the arts (notably in architecture) which marks the period of Timur and his immediate successors."

An embassy from King Henry III. of Castile to Timur, in 1403-6, enables Dr. Holden to picture the court of the great warrior king, though not very vividly, and to give one of those striking comparisons that form such a valuable feature of his commentary:

"Perhaps the most striking idea to be obtained from the narrative is that the intellectual superiority of the envoys to the Moguls (which we unthinkingly and at once assume) is less marked than one might have expected. Timur's officers do not seem especially rude and ignorant as compared with the Spanish gentlemen. Timur's court was not a mere assembly of his officials. It was organised in a fashion as orderly as that of the Spanish King. . . . Timur himself was a far more important figure than any of his Western contemporaries."

To complete the view of Timur, Dr. Holden outlines his life as told by the native historians, samples his maxims of government, and essays to reconcile these liberal-minded precepts with the known facts of his career. This is a very able and serviceable endeavour. As he says, "it is of immense interest to know that this absolute ruler even cared to appear to posterity as an enlightened king." And he concludes that, "great as was his genius and success as a captain, we are forced to give an equal admiration to his intelligence as a ruler." Timur's own explanation of his objects in coming to Hindustan, and of the motives that prompted his intention "to exterminate the idolaters of China," are sufficiently curious from the Western and modern view. The comparison indicated by the death of Chaucer less than five years before the death of Timur is full of suggestion.

The succeeding emperors are treated with like thoughtful care and discriminative illustration. Babar's military activity and his personal virtues stand out in prominence, and Dr. Holden applies himself to read certain puzzles in his history. This is his conclusion:—

"Two sayings of Babar's, placed side by side, give the key to all his public actions. 'Inspired as I was with an ambition for conquest and for extensive dominion, I would not, on account of one or two defeats, sit down and look idly around me'; and again, 'How can any man of understanding pursue such a line of conduct as, after his death, must stain his fair fame? The wise have well called Fame a second existence.'

"The circumstances of Oriental and Western life are totally dissimilar. 'Between us and them crawls the nine-times-twisted stream of Death.' If we can make the needed allowances for these differences of time and circumstances, Babar will appear not unworthy to be classed with the great Cæsar as a general, as an administrator, as a man of letters. His character is more lovable than Cæsar's, and reminds us of Henry IV. of France and Navarre. He conquered India and founded a mighty empire. Take him for all in all, he was the most admirable of the Mogul kings."

Babar fulfilled the highest Turki ideal; he had "prudence, knowledge, energy, ambition and generosity—qualities from which nobility draws its name." His son, Humayun, spent his whole life in agitation or in exile, having too much of the milk of human kindness for the vigour necessary in his circumstances. The successive raids, sieges, captures, flights of his reign "read like the annals of a band of Sioux."

"But the wars in Europe at the same epoch, were they materially different? We forget that modern war began with Napoleon's campaigns. And as to the barbarous tribes, do we not find almost exact parallels in the cruel revolutions in South American states even to-day? In Chile? In the Argentine? In Brazil? In Honduras? There are no prisoners taken. The corpses of the dead are terribly mutilated. The captured cities are looted, and their inhabitants inhumanly outraged."

Humayun set before himself three principles of conduct in all circumstances: "First of all, integrity of design; then, energy in action; and, finally, moderation in success; ascribing all the glory to an overruling Providence, and nothing to the merits of man." It was the second that he too often failed to carry out in practice. "His renown has suffered," Dr. Holden points out, "in that his reign came between the brilliant conquests of Babar and the beneficent statesmanship of Akbar; but," he concludes, "he was not unworthy to be the son of the one and the father of the other."

It is not necessary to follow the illustration. Yet it is tempting enough. The sketch of Akbar the Great is admirable; and, by this time, Dr. Holden finds, "the blood of Timur had been thinned so that it ran calmly in the veins of a great statesman and a good king, and the lust of mere conquest was replaced by a sincere desire for 'the happiness and prosperity of the husbandman.'" Very attractive, too, is the sketch of Jahangir, with the account of Sir Thomas Roe's mission to the Emperor's court. "It is easily to be seen that the real success of Sir Thomas's mission was due to his personality, and not to the fame of England or to the value of his gifts;" and "that Sir Thomas Roe, a modern Briton, was continually and unconsciously comparing the Emperor Jahangir with his own English king, not always to the advantage of the latter." A charming chapter is devoted to Nur-Mahal (the Light of the Palace), "whose reign was nearly contemporaneous with that of King James I. of England, the successor of Elizabeth, and who may fairly be compared with that great English queen."

"If we think of the contemporaries of the Indian Empress, we shall not find her equal. We are forced to go back to the great Elizabeth for a term of comparison even. While she lived, Nur-Mahal was the greatest personage in all Asia, if not in the whole world."

For Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb the work of Bernier is laid under contribution. The Taj-Mahal is mentioned, as being the tomb of the wife of Shah Jahan—"a dream in marble, designed by Titans and finished by jewellers." "The Ruin of Aurangzeb" is a reprint of Sir W. W. Hunter's masterly sketch of the downfall of the last of the great Mogul Emperors.

The *Times* stated on December 17th, that the Amír Abdur Rahman had decided to reduce to submission the mountain state and people of Kafiristan. "All the necessary arrangements have been made to commence operations as soon as the passes are open, and," the *Times* added, "the Amír has satisfied himself that he will meet with no opposition from the tribes of India in carrying out what has long been one of his most cherished designs!"

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

DITTICISMS.[1]

"STONY-HEARTED reviewer" has become a proverbial phrase, and like many proverbs it conveys a germ of truth. It is in fact an illustration of what the serious call the natural law of adaptation to environment. Some of the tasks of the reviewer require the "heart bound round with oak and triple "brass" of Horace. His it is to venture on perilous voyages, and warn the unwary general reader of the dangers and trials that beset his course. It is only a sense of the essential loftiness of his mission that nerves him for the reading of such volumes as "Divers Ditties," by Mr. A McMillan M.A. The title is unfortunately chosen. It at once suggest comparisons with "Departmental "Ditties" which in spite of Kipling "boom" and Kipling "slump" remain the truest and most humorous sketches of Anglo-Indian life yet published. Nor does the preface greatly reassure the reader. There we learn that most of these verses have appeared in the poet's corner of the Allahabad *Pioneer*, one set in the *Literary World*, and another, "Bonnie Bell," in *London Society*. The author expresses a hope that English readers will take an interest in the numerous types of Anglo-Indian which he endeavours to portray, and enumerates them. Surely it was rash enough to invite comparisons by his choice of title, without directly challenging Kipling on his own ground by labelling his characters with names and descriptions already familiar to readers of "Departmental Ditties." Messrs. Thacker and Spink could have assured Mr. McMillan, if they chose to give him information about their sales, that English readers do take an interest in Anglo-Indian types. But we very much doubt whether that interest will take the form or go the length of creating a demand for "Divers "Ditties." Acting apparently under the influence of the same Até that prompted the publication of the volume, the author gave first place to twelve pages of wilfully comic verses entitled "Anundorum "Borooah," an elaborate attempt to chaff one of the few Indian Civil Servants who have succeeded in overcoming the obstacles placed in the way of native competitors by a jealous Government. The effect of this production, meeting the reader on the very threshold, is to fill him with a foreboding that the author has with his Scotch name got little or none of that enviable gift, Scotch humour, and a superfluity of that terrible drawback to literary charm, Scotch wit. The impression is confirmed by a more extended perusal of the book. "Alun "Aheer," a poem free from all affectation of ponderous wit, and "The Civilian Obadiahs," the metre of which lends a certain lightness to the matter, may be exempted from the general condemnation, although towards the end of the latter the author's deficiency in that sense of contrast which forms so large a constituent of true humour leads him into a painful bathos. At last with patience exhausted we feel inclined to applaud Mr. McMillan's prayer on p. 5:

> "May vengeful Heaven strike me dumb"

or to accept without question his explanation on p. 12:

> "I feel that not by slow degrees
> I grow beyond all hope insane"

and again to give in our adherence to his description of the newspaper that published these versicles as

> "The evil speaking *Pioneer*."

It is more especially in the explanatory footnotes that Mr. McMillan's wit, freed from the trammels of metre, flaunts itself in all its beauty. Here is an instance: "The information contained in horo-"scopes," writes this acute Master of Arts, "is not "always very exact, and, so far as exact, not always accurate." The slender difference of meaning between the two words is an unsafe medium for a funambulatory display of Mr. McMillan's genius, and he comes down heavily. In some cases he shows great consideration by enclosing the point of the joke in square brackets lest the incautious reader, stumbling upon it unawares, should hurt himself. For example: "Spins. Unmarried and "[more or less] marriageable ladies are called spins "in India—short for spinsters." Or take this remarkably apposite reflection of an autobiographical nature:—

> "Their own dear selves did much delight,
> And [sometimes] pleased their audience too."

This at once suggests the reason for the writing of "Divers Ditties," if not reasons for their publication. But for the latter proceeding, too, motives may be found on purely internal evidence, and, having so far quarrelled with the author, it is only fair that we should put on record the points in his work in which we fully concur. They are these:

> "The poet pines for laurelled fame
> His cankered brow to bind,
> His quest is but an empty name
> That fleeteth as the wind."

> "Song of the Spin, a long way after the 'Song of the Shirt'."

> "And the meed that labour and merit have missed,
> Falls to a fortunate dunce or drone."

But is that any reason why a presumably honest man should try to take advantage of fortune's blindness by publishing the productions of a too little occupied leisure?

If we appear to take too severe a view of a work which, in spite of some prejudiced opinions on Indian matters, is harmless, and shows here and there some traces of merit, it is because we believe that while there is room in literature for third-rate prose, if, like a late Professor's, it is valuable for the information it embodies, no verse can endure or be endured which is not excellent of its kind and perfect in manner. Such work is not altogether out of place in the columns of a penny paper or even an ephemeral magazine where it may pass unnoticed. But the claim to rank as literature which is implied by its issue in book form, beautifully printed and bound, is a claim that cannot be too emphatically denied. The minor poet is the canker of modern literature. If Mr. McMillan had

[1] Divers Ditties, chiefly written in India, with appendices by Alec McMillan, M.A., Bengal Civil Service (retired). (Westminster: A. Constable and Co.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ever dined with a deaf old gentleman, and been forced to repeat for the latter's benefit his best after-dinner witticism that had set the table in a roar, he would have found in the faint indulgent smile which greeted its third repetition an object-lesson illustrating the difference between sparks thrown off in the clash of conversation and the steadier flame necessary to illuminate permanent productions. Many a wit has ruined his reputation by publishing, and we can quite believe that the author of "Divers Ditties" has had some reputation as a wit. Finally, we have one word of comfort for Mr. McMillan. In a ballad entitled "On the Road to Pepityapore"—once more we join issue with the author on the presumptuous choice of a title—he says:—

"But often in camp when the day's work is sped,
As I sit by my fire with the stars overhead,
Old memories pondering o'er,
I think of the lass with the dark beaming eye,
And swear to hold dear till I drivel or die,
That sweetest of hours by the tamarind high,
On the road to Pepityapore."

Let Mr. McMillan be comforted. He is absolved from his oath. He has drivelled.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Major-General Sir Edwin Henry Hayter Collen, K.C.I.E., as Military Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in succession to Sir Henry Brackenbury, whose tenure of the appointment expires in April next.

Mr. Bertram Currie, who was appointed to the Council of India in 1880 for his special knowledge of financial subjects, ceased to be a Member of the Council on December 11th, by the operation of the Act which forbids any further extension of his tenure of the appointment.

Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart, governor of the Chelsea Hospital, has been reappointed to the Council of India for a further period of five years. This mark of favour from the Government will (said the *St. James's Gazette*) give great satisfaction in India, where Sir Donald won his honours, and for the welfare of whose army he has worked with incessant vigour on the Council since his first appointment in 1885. It is interesting also from the fact that Lord George Hamilton has not allowed Sir Donald's views on the Chitral question to put an end to his usefulness on the Council. Sir Donald was one of the staunchest supporters of the Chitral policy of the late Government, since reversed by the present Administration. The Council now consists of ten members, and there is some speculation as to whether the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Bertram Currie will be filled up, differences of opinion prevailing as to whether the Council need exceed the statutory minimum of ten.

Those who, like ourselves (wrote the *Westminster Gazette*) cannot accept the so-called forward policy in India will be glad to see that it has been decided to reappoint so experienced a trans-frontier soldier and opponent of further annexation on the north-west as Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart as member of the Council of India for a further period of five years. But what about Mr. Balfour's assertion that all those who are against the forward policy are unmindful of the "honour" of England? Why, then, honour Sir Donald?

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Stephen George Sale, barrister-at-law, to be a judge of the High Court at Calcutta, in the room of Mr. John Freeman Norris, Q.C., who has been permitted to retire.

Mr. Chamberlain has cancelled the regulations under which competitive examinations for colonial cadetships have hitherto been held, and the Civil Service Commissioners have agreed that examinations for these appointments shall in future be held simultaneously with the examinations for Class I. clerkships in the Home Civil Service and for the Indian Civil Service, under regulations identical, so far as the subjects of examination are concerned, with those prescribed for the Class I. and Indian Civil Service schemes. The change will come into effect at the examination to be held in August, 1896, if any vacancies for colonial cadetships are then offered for competition. It is to be hoped that India will be credited with a fair share of the saving which will thus be effected.

A banquet was given on St. Andrew's night, at the Holborn Restaurant, to Mr. Moolraj Bhagwanani, "who, as the foremost son of the native State of Khairpur, has been the first to achieve success as a scholar, graduate, and barrister." Mr. Moolraj Bhagwanani is the son of the Minister of the State of Khairpur, and was sent to England by the late Amír to qualify himself for the highest post in the State. A distinguished company assembled to do him honour on the eve of his departure from London, including Judge Bagshawe, Professor Murison, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

It is satisfactory to have to record that Indian questions are exciting increasing interest in England. Besides the meetings which are usually held at this time of the year by the East India Association and the National Indian Association, two other meetings were held in the first week of December, one in connexion with the Balloon Society, and the other a drawing-room meeting at the house of Miss Toynbee. At the latter an amusing incident occurred, showing the length to which some Anglo-Indians will go. Mr. K. Connell was the chief speaker, and gave an interesting address on the subject "How India is Governed." His account was, on the whole, fair and impartial, but, as was pointed out by Mr. A. Nundy, who was called upon to reply to him, so long as Mr. Connell confined himself to facts, no exception could be taken to his observations; but where he ventured to express opinions, he went wrong.

Mr. Connell, in the course of his address, referred to Mr. Crouch, an Anglo-Indian who was present, as a greater authority on Indian matters than himself, and wound up his speech by declaring that it was an undoubted fact that British rule in India was a great blessing to the people. Mr. Nundy, who followed him, whilst fully appreciating the good

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

results of British rule in India, contended that it was not an unmixed blessing, for from personal experience he could say that all except the money-lending classes had been impoverished, as a natural consequence of a policy which necessitated the heavy drain of fifteen to twenty millions sterling per annum from India to England. This statement was more than Mr. Crouch could stand. Addressing the meeting, he laid it down that anyone could see for himself that all classes of persons in India were more prosperous now than they were in former times, and as to the enormous drain of money referred to by Mr. Nundy, he was strongly of opinion that the greater the drain of money from a country, the greater was its prosperity. This remark provoked considerable merriment, which was resumed when Mr. Connell, in his final reply, threw over Mr. Crouch, whom he had referred to as an authority. Mr. Connell could not have done otherwise. He has himself written some very interesting papers on "Indian Pauperism: its Causes and Effects," and he holds decided views on the consequences of this heavy drain of money from India to England.

A drawing-room meeting, at which a large number of European and Indian ladies and gentlemen were present, was lately held at the house of Lord Hobhouse, when Mr. Manomohan Ghose gave an interesting address on social progress in India during the last thirty years, and pointed out that it was a fallacy to suppose that the people of India were at a standstill in their ideas upon social and domestic matters. He confined his remarks entirely to the Bengal Presidency, and adduced facts which go far to absolve Bengalis from the reproach, constantly levelled against them, of caring more for political advancement than for moral and social reform.

On December 9th, at the Balloon Society, an animated debate took place on a paper read by Miss Müller, entitled "Anglo-Indians in India." The opener of the debate, whilst giving Anglo-Indians full credit for their good intentions, deprecated the roughness of manner and the absence of sympathy towards Indians on the part of a good many Englishmen, and hoped that both races would in future try to cultivate more kindly feelings towards each other—a view that was endorsed by other speakers who followed her.

At a meeting of the London Indian Society, held on December 14th, Mr. A. Nundy spoke on the subject, "Was the Government Justified in Occupying Chitral?" After referring to the policy of the Government of India, after the mutiny, as one of non-intervention with any of the frontier chiefs, and of masterly inactivity, Mr. Nundy discussed the incidents that led to its reversal by Lord Lytton, who first initiated the policy of aggrandisement and extension. The posting of British agents beyond the Indian frontier, the speaker contended, necessarily led to complications and events which the Government of India was quick to resent as acts of insult or aggression. Primarily, the Government was responsible for the events which led to the Chitral campaign, and under any circumstances there was no justification for the occupation of the country on the grounds (i) That it constituted a direct breach of the proclamation issued at the time of the advance of the British troops; (ii) That, as the expedition was of a punitive nature, it was unnecessary to occupy the country; (iii) That it imposed on the people of India an unnecessary and cruel burden both in the expense of the expedition and in the expense attendant on retention; (iv) That the country was barren and without any resources which could be developed; and (v) That the occupation of the country would lead to further complications and afford fresh grounds for aggression on the part of the British Government. A lively discussion followed, and the sense of the meeting was, as might be expected, against the policy of occupation.

LORD HOBHOUSE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Lord Hobhouse has played a conspicuous part on the Imperial stage. Yet he does not regard smaller duties as fit only for those who have not been rulers over ten cities. When the newly formed London County Council chose him as an Alderman in 1888, he accepted the office, and for some time worked heartily as Chairman of the Corporate Property Committee, and as a member of various other committees. Failing health and the influenza are answerable for his retirement from London's Parliament. As he himself says: "A man might give up all his life to the work of the County Council, and do little else, so absorbing is it." Yet Lord Hobhouse is still a vestryman, interested as a lawyer in the legal affairs of Marylebone and just now in the revision of the Vestry bye-laws. As the clock neared noon he informed me that Vestry work was awaiting his attention.

It need scarcely be said that Lord Hobhouse is a judge of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that he is a K.C.S.I. and a C.I.E., or that for five years he served in India as Legal Member of the Supreme Council of the Viceroy. Lord Hobhouse sailed for India in 1872.

"Lord Mayo," he said in reply to my first question, "was Viceroy when I was first appointed, but his assassination in the Andaman Islands quickly followed, so that my appointment practically coincided with that of Lord Northbrook. These five years were rather a quiet time, a period of rest following one of unusual legislative activity. Both Lord Northbrook and I were advised by the Secretary of State that we hardly required much fresh legislation."

"But of course it would not be true to say that nothing of great importance happened whilst you were in India?"

"There are always important administrative matters in India of which you hear nothing in England. As Law Member of Council, I had constantly to advise my colleagues in such matters from my point of view. You may see the multitude and variety of topics by glancing over these volumes, which contain a portion of my notes and minutes. The greater part of my work was of the executive and on the legislative side it was my business to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

superintend every measure, and to pilot most of them through Council. Perhaps the most difficult and laborious one was the remodelling of the Civil Procedure Code. But though I was the mouthpiece for it, and in the last resort responsible for its contents, the hardest part of the work was done by Mr. Whitley Stokes, the Secretary of the Legislative Department and my successor as Law Member, a draftsman of rare skill and ability, and equipped with great knowledge of the subject."

"Was any effort made to ascertain native opinion?"

"Yes, such as our position allowed. All points of importance were submitted to the provincial authorities, who in their turn consulted such Indian gentlemen as were likely to give useful opinions—a very poor substitute for the searching public discussion of England, but the best we could get. And our first proposals were often modified, sometimes abandoned, under its influence."

"From the purely legal point of view, I suppose, it is an advantage as regards the actual passing of measures to work under non-representative institutions, as there is less need to wait upon public opinion?"

Lord Hobhouse shook his head emphatically. "No, no; a very grave disadvantage. You may seem to move on faster, but what does that matter, if the ground is not sure under your feet? Under a despotism, you do not know where the people are, you grope in the dark. You wonder what they think of a measure, whether it is in advance of public opinion, and if so, how much; you have not the guidance of representative bodies."

"The organisation known as the Indian National Congress is believed to help officials to ascertain the state of opinion. Do you agree with its policy?"

"I must confess that of recent years Indian affairs have not so much occupied my mind as they perhaps ought to do. I have more and more devoted such energy as I have left to affairs at home. But naturally I regard any change or movement without ascertaining public opinion as dangerous, and it seems to me the Government of India should welcome any help that such a body as the Congress can give them. So for as I can learn, its leaders have shown ability and moderation."

"It seems to have provoked abuse from the Anglo-Indian press."

"When I was in India the English papers I saw struck me as being ably and temperately conducted. But since our system has brought so many active, ambitious and educated Indians to the front, I suspect some feeling has arisen, and I dare say, expressed itself. But mind, I do not profess to judge of this, as I do not read Indian papers."

"Still, you have observed the recrudescence of the 'forward' frontier policy?"

"I am afraid that I hold unpopular opinions upon it, as I am opposed to the 'forward' policy. I shared Lord Lawrence's views on the subject. I became acquainted with him on my return to England; and worked with him to try to prevent the Afghan War in 1878. My views on the frontier policy were formed when I was little more than a boy, during the first Afghan Wars from 1838 to 1841. I then saw, and nothing has occurred to make me change that opinion, but everything to confirm it, that a 'forward' policy is full of danger and difficulty. Your frontier must be somewhere. An empire extended by conquest does not mean strength, but the contrary. And extension of territory is a costly business, both in war and in the administration which follows. The expense of organising newly acquired provinces is heavy, and in the present critical condition of Indian finance this is a consideration of the first importance. My conviction is that with contented Indian subjects no attack from outside need alarm us, even if anybody threatened it, and nobody has, that I know of. I think that we are incurring the real and great dangers of insolvency or over-taxation to meet the imaginary danger of invasion. Also that we meet it in the most blundering way, by extending our frontier, and holding posts further and further from our true base, the sea, and from the populous parts of India whence we draw our resources."

"The wonder is how that policy of unceasing advance ever came to be begun. Since you saw its unwisdom at an early age, surely there were men in England who perceived the dangers it entails?"

"Some statesmen opposed it, of course, but the naval and military and semi-military men of all countries favour conquest, and override their opponents. They are very strong in India. Then, in 1838, Lord Palmerston was Foreign Secretary. He vigorously waved the British flag, and was possessed by jealousy of Russia, which was very unreasonable, I have always thought."

"I remember reading a forcible memorandum which the Queen sent to Lord Palmerston on his failure to consult her sufficiently in the matter of foreign despatches."

"Yes, he was afterwards dismissed, but had to come back. His popularity was very great. He was not Foreign Minister when the Crimean war broke out, but his influence would be on that side, and during the war he became Premier. But whether we think Lord Palmerston right or wrong in his aggressive hostility to Russia, he was a most efficient man, and a thorough master of his business. Later we had Disraeli for Minister, who appealed to the same feelings of jealousy of Russia when the second Afghan war broke out. He followed Palmerston's game, but with far less ability and knowledge. But there I am touching upon disputed topics, nor can I compress into a sentence what requires an essay. To me nothing is clearer than that aggrandisement spells weakness, and raises up difficulties with our neighbours, consuming our energies in allaying them."

"Was it not Matthew Arnold who said that the French lack morals and the English lack intelligence? Perhaps we don't understand our real interests."

"I don't know that the French understand theirs any better. They insist upon colonising when they have not the necessary surplus population. They took Tunis, which has been nothing but a source of showy weakness to them, much as Egypt is at this moment to ourselves."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"You spoke a moment ago, Lord Hobhouse, of the ambition of Young India. Do you think there is anything in the native character likely to prevent Indians from exercising power wisely?"

"Of course, the Indians are mostly conquered peoples, and have been so for many centuries; and that position has a tendency to stunt certain qualities which conquering and free peoples possess—for example, the quality of command and the readiness to undertake responsibility. But I am not a believer in race, as some men believe in it. I mean, I see no vast difference such as would entitle one race always to rule and cause another to be ruled. Different races have at different periods shown the qualities that we associate with a ruling race. Sometimes one, sometimes another, has been dominant. Few Indians have had the training necessary for men who are to rule."

"You say that Indians are a conquered race. But is it not true that we conquered one section of them by means of another, and thus gained the supremacy?"

"There is no Indian race, but many races; no nation, but many nations, religions, languages, castes and other divisions, all in discord with one another. That is how we, being solid, prevailed over the vast, incoherent mass. I believe the earlier conquerors, Pathans and Mughals, found the same state of things, and prevailed in the same way. Besides, the ground is not entirely untrodden. We know perfectly well that some Indians can rule, for we have seen, not to go back to Hyder Ali or to Sikh or Mahratta chieftains, men like Dinkar Rao, Salar Jung, Madhava Rao, very able administrators. Even inborn characteristics require opportunity, else development is impossible. The goverment must be worked by means of Indians more and more. I am convinced that this is an absolute necessity."

"You remember, of course, the storm Lord Ripon raised by holding such views. Anglo-Indians protested against the idea that any posts should be given to Indians, except those that Europeans did not consider worth accepting."

"Yes, and if ever a man moved cautiously in the matter, that man was Lord Ripon. The outcry was against the principle of giving any authority to the native Indian—not the first time it has happened in Anglo-Indian history."

"Did you see much of Indian society, Lord Hobhouse?"

"Of course I had business relations with many Indian gentlemen, but in our sense of the word society, there cannot be said to be any between Europeans and Indians. When people cannot eat together, when the ladies of a household cannot communicate with the outer world, there can be none of that free and unrestrained intercourse which you are thinking of when you ask about society. The caste system prevails, even among Muhammadans, and although it is doubtless a powerful cement of the social fabric on a small scale, it is a bar to both personal intercourse, and to action on a large scale. I several times, indeed often, sat on committees with Indian gentlemen, and found a good proportion of them able and thoroughly competent. Several Bengal zemindars struck me as highly educated and well read, and their opinions on subjects known to them were well worth having."

"Were there any Indian gentlemen in the Viceroy's Council in your time?"

"The Viceroy's Council is really two bodies, one is the Executive, on which are seven high state officials, and there is no native of India upon it. When the Council sits in its legislative capacity, there are about twenty members, and in my time three or four of these were Indians. I believe the number is larger now."

C. S. BREMNER.

LORD G. HAMILTON ON THE COTTON DUTIES.

Lord George Hamilton, Secretary of State for India, received on December 11th, at the India Office, a large and representative deputation of persons interested in the Lancashire cotton trade, on the subject of the Cotton Duties. In reply to the deputation Lord G. Hamilton said:

"I felt it my duty, as soon as a general wish was conveyed to me from Lancashire that I should receive a deputation on the cotton duties, that I ought at once to accede to the request, but I believe the majority of you know the conditions under which I expressed my willingness to receive such a deputation. They are contained in a letter, and I think all those who have heard that letter read will understand the reasons why I must now speak with a certain amount of reserve. Several of the speakers have reminded me that this is not the first time I have had the honour to receive a deputation from Lancashire. I went through the old agitation which took place some twenty years or more back, resulting in the abolition of the duties imposed in India, and I am certain that no man who has had the official experience I have had and who has come into contact with representatives of Lancashire ever can pretend that this question is a mere local one, or that those who speak or agitate upon it are influenced by motives either of selfishness or of greed. (Cheers.) I have endeavoured always to look at the question from one point of view and one alone—namely, from the Imperial view—(cheers)—not from the local interests of Lancashire on the one side or of Bombay on the other. Now, it is admitted by every one that, excepting perhaps the ties which race and religion may weave, the bonds of commerce are the most powerful instruments known for knitting together the interests of scattered communities and of welding them together into an empire. But if trade and commerce are so to work they must operate equally for the interests which they touch—(hear, hear)—and whenever it is in any way necessary to adopt a tariff policy which sets great industrial communities in different parts of the world in the same empire in antagonism or collision one with another, then the germs of disunion are created and the stability of that empire is threatened. We all know that, as locomotion and facilities of transport are accelerated and developed, so the power of trade and commerce both in binding and disintegrating communities and empires is increased. Therefore, I have always treasured up the happy words of the present Prime Minister, who, in summing up the controversy twenty years ago, said this was a matter of dangerous contention and it was only under conditions of emergency or exigency that recourse in any way ought to be had to such a policy.

THE FINANCIAL EXIGENCIES OF INDIA.

Unfortunately, as several speakers have admitted, that financial exigency exists, and it was for the purpose of establishing an equilibrium in Indian finance that these duties were imposed. Since they were imposed the position of Indian finance has slightly improved, and I hope it will continue to improve. Reference has been made to members of the Indian Government, and especially to Sir James Westland. Let me say that I have had a great many communications with Sir James Westland, and a fairer, straighter, or stronger man I

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

have never met. He is bound to look at this question, as Finance Minister, from both sides, and I find no bias or prejudice in his mind; indeed, in one sense, he is your best friend. If an equilibrium can be established between Indian expenditure and revenue, so that these duties can be dispensed with, it is admitted that they are the first tax that should be dealt with. No man has striven harder to effect that end than Sir James Westland, and if in the course of a few years that satisfactory result is attained, it will be more due to Sir James Westland than to any other living man. The principle involved is an important one, and I think some of the critics hardly realise the magnitude of the interests which you represent. Great Britain is the greatest manufacturing and exporting country in the world. I do not know if many people are aware that, taking the returns of the last ten years, the exports of the cotton trade alone comprise twenty-five per cent. on the average of the whole total annual exports of Great Britain. They amount on the average to the enormous total of sixty millions sterling. On the other hand, India is the great receiving market for cotton goods. Its population comprises one-fifth of the human race, and it has taken during the past ten years on the average from thirty to forty per cent. of the total cotton exports of this country. Therefore, the question is one which you are perfectly right in raising in the shape you have done. I have looked at it from both points of view. No one will contend that it is for the benefit of India that the consumers there should pay five per cent. more than they did before; and therefore, if a satisfactory equilibrium between income and expenditure could be established, it would be as much to the interests of India as of Lancashire that the duties should be abolished. It is, as has been observed, almost impossible to draw a hard and fast line through a vast number of varying qualities of goods and say that a tax shall only apply on this side of the line and not on the other. (Hear, hear.) The inevitable tendency of increase on one side is to draw up those on the other in sympathy with it, and therefore the Indian consumer will understand that in the aggregate he pays under this system more for his cotton goods than the Government receive from the duties imposed. Therefore, we are all agreed that if we had the power to dispense with these duties we would gladly do so. There is equal agreement as to the conditions under which the duties were imposed. Sir H. Fowler stated in the clearest possible manner that, in his opinion, the duties were in no sense to be protective. And he was so confident that they would not operate in that direction that he did not consult Parliament before imposing them. The Indian Government have fully accepted the conditions under which alone they were to legislate, and it will be observed that in the circular recently addressed to the Bombay Chamber of Commerce they announced that they intended loyally to adhere to the conditions.

THE ALLEGED DELAY.

Now I come to the main point of the speeches—namely, that there has been considerable and even, as some put it, unwarrantable delay in answering the memorial I received some time back. On that point, I want gentlemen just to bear in mind what are the difficulties of the Council here and the Council in India. These duties have been imposed on the condition that an excise is to fully countervail the import duty. To establish perfect equality is an exceedingly difficult matter. Mr. Whittaker, who is a complete master of every technicality of the cotton business, met my predecessor, Sir H. Fowler, here with others on May 27th. Sir H. Fowler asked them to state in a succinct form on paper their case. It arrived on July 9th. You will see, therefore, that although they were experts, professing a knowledge of all the technicalities of the cotton trade, yet even in drawing up one side of the case they occupied no less than six weeks. I do not think it is unreasonable that the Indian Government, who have to consider not one side only but both sides of the case, and—if we come to the opinion that any alteration is necessary—have to consider what those alterations should be, it is not unreasonable that we should be allowed a little time to mature our answer. I can assure you that, so far from there being delay, as soon as the general election was over I took the matter in hand and have been in constant communication with the Indian Government ever since. Now, you will understand that it would have been easy to have sent an answer very quickly to a memorial of that kind. Whenever a petition or a memorial is addressed to a Government praying for alteration of taxation, if the Government wishes to refuse the memorial they can answer quickly; but if, on the other hand, they believe there is something in the memorial that requires further consideration, and that upon further consideration legislation may be necessary, then the position is changed. It is a cardinal maxim in tariffs that no Government should allow a great interval to elapse between the declaration of their intention and their action upon such intention. You know it is the invariable practice when any deputation waits on the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to any existing tax that they do not get a final answer until he introduces the Budget. Now, we have made considerable advance; and I hope that in the course of a very short time we may be able to give you an answer. To every pledge that my predecessor made, of course I adhere; and I sincerely hope that whatever conclusions we may arrive at may in some way contribute towards the re-establishment of the prosperity of your industry. Mr. Holmes drew attention to the great difference between the amount of piece-goods exported last year and this year, and he seemed entirely to attribute the difference of 22½ per cent. to the action of the cotton duties. But it must be recollected that last year the exports to India were exceptionally high. I believe they exceeded the quantity imported in any preceding year. Stocks were undoubtedly excessive at the commencement of the year, and I have little doubt that these excessive stocks contributed materially to the difference between the exports of this and last year to which attention has been called. But I quite admit the force of one statement made by different speakers. When a trade is in so depressed a condition as the Lancashire cotton trade is, uncertainty as to its future tends greatly to aggravate that depression.

WHAT LANCASHIRE HAS TO FACE.

I have looked at the question perfectly impartially, and I say frankly to you that I do not believe, even if it were possible, that repeal would at once bring to you all the prosperity you anticipate. From the figures relating to the exports of India I find that during the last ten years the value of cotton exports from Great Britain to countries other than India has not increased, but, on the other hand, the exports from the Indian mills during that period have literally doubled, and there is this year a large increase in the amount exported. Therefore, it is clear that quite independently of these import duties, and in places where they do not operate, there is increasing competition between the products of Indian and Lancashire cotton mills. It is better to look the situation in the face. You have to deal with new conditions of competition.

EQUALITY OF TREATMENT.

I have belief in the capacity of Lancashire to adapt herself to almost any condition, provided she has fair play. That fair play you ask from the present Government. They, in common with their predecessors, are pledged to give that fair play, and by fair play I mean prefect equality of treatment. (Cheers.) You ask for nothing more, and, as I understand, Bombay asks for nothing more. You have stated that the Indian Government have unduly consulted the Bombay Chamber of Commerce and merchants upon their legislation, but you must recollect that the cotton merchants at Bombay were the only persons whom the Indian Government could consult. And you contended, I think, that my predecessor in office did not sufficiently consult Lancashire. Well, I am fully in possession of the views of Lancashire. Lancashire wishes certain alterations to be made in the existing tariff. I am bound under these conditions to let Bombay have its full say on any such proposition. Therefore, if I cannot say any more to you than this, I think we can exchange ideas which, to a certain extent, will be satisfactory. You impress upon me the necessity of pushing this matter forward as rapidly as possible in consequence of great damage being done to your industry. I admit that that fact is already known to the Viceroy, and I will emphasise it by repeating to him the results of this interview. (Cheers.) On the other hand, I think you will agree that, pending the date at which we can remove these duties, whatever is done now should be done fully, thoroughly, and finally. In whatever spirit any changes may be considered, it must be of an equitable and judicial character. It is essential they should be associated with such a full investigation of every detail of this complicated question that we should not fail in our object, the fulfilling of the pledges we have given. (Cheers.) I can assure you I will do my best to accelerate the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

reply and decision of the Indian Government, and I will forward to the Indian Government the substance of the communications which you have made to me, and I am quite confident these communications will be received in a sympathetic and equitable spirit." (Cheers.)

LORD JAMES'S REPLY TO SIR H. JAMES.

Lord James of Hereford, formerly Sir Henry James, Q.C., M.P., delivered at Bury, Lancashire, on November 20th, a farewell address to his former constituents. His remarks included the following passage referring to the Indian cotton duties. The contrast between it and the speech which Sir Henry James delivered in the House of Commons last February is interesting and instructive:—

"There is one question which I know is of great interest to the whole of Lancashire, and therefore, of great interest to you. The textile trade of this great community is at present in such a condition that anything that affects its interests, anything that hampers its free action, must be a matter of acute importance to Lancashire men. Therefore, I am certain you will fully appreciate the view that has been expressed by the representatives of Lancashire, and in a humble way by your former member, and expressed in a far more emphatic manner by your present member, that the existence of import duties affecting the importation of our goods to India, so long as they afford protection, and, therefore, opposition to Lancashire, is a matter deserving of the fullest consideration of the Government. (Cheers.) It is no very difficult task to make clear to those I now address the position which this question now occupies. There can be no misunderstanding, I think, as to the intention of the late Government when giving their sanction to the imposition of these import duties. The late Secretary of State for India (Sir Henry Fowler), speaking in July last year, when answering a question put to him in relation to those import duties, gave the following answer:—'The resolution of the House of Commons of July 10, 1877, with reference to the Indian import duties on cotton goods was to the following effect:—"That, in the opinion of this House, the duties now levied upon cotton manufactures imported into India, being protective in their nature, are contrary to sound commercial policy and ought to be repealed without delay, as soon as the financial condition of India will permit." The resolution deals with duties that are protective in their nature, and I have already stated to the House that, in my opinion, the executive Government ought not to sanction steps which would reverse that decision without giving an opportunity for discussion in this House of Commons. The imposition of duties which would not be protective in their character is not affected by the resolution.' In a debate that took place in February of this year Sir Henry Fowler, representing the Government, repeated that he did not intend to sanction duties that were protective in their character. He offered to meet Lancashire on the subject. Delay occurred through the serious illness of Sir Henry Fowler, but the moment he was able to meet a deputation he met them. I think those who were present know that he then expressed the same view, and he asked that Lancashire should draw up a statement in writing in support of their contention that an import duty, not met with a sufficient countervailing duty, gave protection to the Indian manufacturer as against Lancashire. That statement was drawn up most ably, and it contained arguments, at least, to show that these duties, as they now exist, are protective to the Indian manufacturer, and give him an advantage as against the Lancashire producer. It was pointed out that the countervailing excise duty upon Indian goods was a 5 per cent. duty upon the yarn only, whilst the duty imposed against the British manufacturers was a duty which covered the weaving, the colouring, and everything incidental to the carriage of the goods. I must say that, whilst I have been most anxious since this subject was mooted that it should be exempt from considerations of party profit or advantage—I hope I may say this without giving offence—I think if Sir Henry Fowler had taken a little more open counsel from Lancashire than he did, he would not, at the time when the duties were imposed, have allowed such a difference to exist between the import duty and the countervailing duty. I know Sir Henry Fowler well. I am certain he is a man who would have been true to every word he uttered. He would have kept faith to the fullest extent, and, if he had remained Secretary of State for India, if it could have been shown that there was this difference between the two things, the duties would have been modified. Before the statement arrived at the India Office, however, the late Government, I think, ceased to exist, and the duty of carrying out the views which have been expressed by Sir Henry Fowler devolved upon the present Government. I am in a position to state that the view he expressed against a protective duty, if it could be shown to be protective, is fully shared by his successor, Lord George Hamilton. The representation has been forwarded to India, and the Indian Government has had its attention called to the argument of Lancashire. It has been pointed out to India that if this duty is protective, in the interests alike of India and Great Britain it ought to be modified. (Cheers.) I am sure there is not a person in Lancashire who will not be reasonable in this matter. The Government have not to act as individual men. They are not, as I was in February, a representative of Lancashire stating the Lancashire case. They must act judicially in this matter, and one necessity of judicial action is that both sides of the case should be heard. India has a right to be heard in this matter. (Hear, hear.) She is a vast portion of this great Empire. Her population, I think I am right in saying, represents one-fifth of the population of the world. She is a great market for Lancashire, and anything that causes India to be disaffected, that shakes our moral power in India, will strike a blow against our Empire in every portion. You have no reason to be afraid. As far as I know, the Government of India has never asked for a duty that shall be protective. I am encouraged to hope by one fact that there will be generous treatment of this question by the Indian Government, and that there will be no attempt to support protection, if it be shown that protection does really exist. I may mention to you that there was a 5 per cent. duty on coarse yarns going into Burma. It was pointed out that that duty was protective, and the Indian Government, exercising its own power, when convinced that the duty was protective, reduced the 5 per cent. duty to a merely nominal sum, so that it does not affect the manufacturer here at all. (Cheers.) That which has been done there one may naturally hope will be the principle upon which the treatment of this complaint by Lancashire will be dealt with. Whilst I am certain that justice will be done by the Indian Government, I am happy to think that Lancashire is not unreasonable. I noticed that on Saturday last a convention, as it was termed, of well-known Lancashire men, mostly connected with the textile trades and largely interested in this question, met in Manchester. The demand they conveyed to the Government was that there should be such a readjustment of the Indian excise duties as would deprive the import dutiies of their present protective character, and that the duties should be abolished as soon as the financial position of India would permit. That is a reasonable demand, and for the reasons that I have given to you, unless it can be shown that these duties are not protective, there is every reason to hope that an equitable modification of them will be effected. All that I am entitled to say at present is that there is no reason to doubt that that modification will be promptly brought into effect." (Cheers.)

Reviews.

A SOLDIER OF THE MUTINY.

With H.M. 9th Lancers during the Indian Mutiny. The Letters of Brevet-Major O. H. S. G. ANSON. Edited by his son, HARCOURT S. ANSON. With portrait frontispiece. (London: W. H. Allen and Co., Limited.)

The Letters constituting this interesting volume cover the short period of fifteen months—from June, 1857, to March, 1858. They were obviously never intended for publication, and they derive a special value from that fact. They owe their existence to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the softer side of the soldier, whose thoughts always turned to his wife and children at Kussowlee. When the Mutiny broke out, Captain Anson had already seen some twenty years' service in India, and had done good service in the field at the battle of Puniar, and at Sobraon, in the Sutlej campaign, and at Gujarat and Chilianwallah in 1849. His excellence as an officer and his absolute devotion to military duty are unimpeachable. Yet the cast of his countenance and the tone of these Letters irresistibly suggest that he would have been more fully in his element in charge of some retired English cure of souls. The tenderness of his conscience is indicated in his keen sense of responsibility at those intervals when he was temporarily placed in command of his regiment. His home affections were peculiarly deep and strong. "How much I should like to see dear little C. in her new brown straw bonnet!" he writes from the camp at Fategarh, January 19th, 1858. "How my heart yearns after you all! This separation from you all for so long is, to a man of my temperament, a very sore calamity." He was constantly writing to his wife, often under the most unpromising circumstances. Throughout the Letters the tone is profoundly religious, but always manly. Major Anson bore a part, at times with conspicuous distinction, in the relief of Delhi, Agra, Lucknow, and Cawnpore. His last day's work was twelve hours on horseback in front of Lucknow, on March 6th, 1858. "It strained me all over," he wrote on the 10th, "and I feel something like a wreck." He was presently invalided, but died at Dehra Dun on January 14th, 1859, at the premature age of forty-one. One closes the volume with the feeling of tragedy.

Major Anson was profoundly impressed with the religious aspect of the situation. "There is no doubt," he writes (June 12, 1857, Camp Delhi Cantonment), "that the rod of God is upon us, that men's hearts are failing them for fear, that God is proving us, bringing us into the snare, and laying trouble upon our loins." For (Aug. 27, 1857, Camp before Delhi) "in building up India, we have thought too much of Mammon and too little of God." Again (Sept. 13, 1857, Camp before Delhi): "Prayers will avail more than all the pomp and circumstance of war and our own arm of flesh to secure our ultimate success." Major Anson is greatly shocked at the reprisals of cruelty that frequently occurred, and even at the lengths to which some of our troops carried the license of plunder.

The following passage is thoroughly characteristic: it is dated Feb. 27, 1858, Camp Newelgunge (10 miles from Bunnee).

"I found the house (residence of one of the ministers of the King of Oudh) gutted, and burning—Evans, the Commissioner, with some of his police, and accompanied by those prime looters, F. and E., having yesterday worked their will on it. F. wanted to present me with a whole handful of little grotesque brass gods and goddesses, and I at first thought that, inasmuch as they could not be well broken, they would be just the things for the children to play with; but, on maturer consideration, I returned the curiosities to him, because they might perchance give an idolatrous turn to the pets, when they saw the servants salaaming to them, and bringing offerings of rice, etc., etc. Don't you think I was right? They were, barring this, such capital playthings that I was sorely tempted to take them."

Major Anson describes in these letters the current events within his own circle, with only the briefest references to outside events. It is extremely curious that the two or three mentions of Baird Smith should be quite unimportant, and that Aleck (Gen. Sir A.) Taylor's name should not (so far as we have noticed) occur in these pages. Sir James Brind once or twice passes across the scene. There are appreciative references to the Lawrences; and a great many details about Sir Hope Grant and General Showers, and Sir Dighton Probyn. Hodson comes in once or twice, and later on Havelock and Outram, and Sir Colin. But these letters can only supplement the general narrative in small details. When Nicholson arrived in camp, there is nothing to indicate his reputation or importance. Perhaps Major Anson assumed ample knowledge in his correspondent. On Nicholson's death, "a great loss indeed he is to the army." The other references of any consequence are worth quotation, as showing Nicholson's temper of mind:—

"I met a crowd of natives on my way to church this morning (Sept. 6, 1857, Camp before Delhi), and Nicholson was in the middle of it haranguing the Europeans, and bidding them for their own interest and comfort conciliate the affections of the Punjabees lately arrived in camp, saying that even the vile refuse who have so deeply revolted from us could and did, as in the instances of the 35th and 26th, appreciate brotherly regard from Europeans; that it was just now of more importance than they imagined to keep on the best of terms with the brave northern levies, and that they were sure to reap the reward of doing so in ensuring their hearty friendship and co-operation in the field. I stopped and listened to him for some time; he has a bad voice, but spoke with good and earnest feeling."

That is a very pleasant glimpse of Nicholson. The next shows him in the fatal street of Delhi:

"I am sorry to say (Sept. 19, 1857) that we failed in an attack on the Lahore Gate, through some unaccountable backwardness of our 8th and 75th who could not be persuaded to advance, though Lieutenant Briscoe, of the 75th, sacrificed himself (being killed by a shower of grape) in a vain endeavour to rouse them. Nicholson's Europeans showed a similar recreancy on the 14th, when ordered to storm the Burn Bastion. He called upon them repeatedly to advance, and, finding that they did not, turned round to harangue them, and had got as far as 'I never would have thought that Europeans would have quailed before niggers,' or words to that effect, when he poor gallant fellow, fell mortally wounded, for the doctors have but very slight hopes of his recovery, the ball having smashed his ribs and sent the bones right into his lungs, causing fearful inflammation."

Those are not the only examples of disgraceful recreancy mentioned. The petty details, however, bring out vividly the daily troubles in camp—the preciousness of a glass of beer, or a cup of tea, or a newspaper, and the discomforts of the heat and the rains and the flies and the decomposing bodies of men and carcasses of animals. The scenes inside Delhi on the capture are in many points vividly depicted. Later, too, Major Anson brings out clearly the embarrassment caused by the protection of the women and children, and more than once he laments over the indiscriminate reprisals. Occasionally he has an eye for the humours, sometimes grim enough, of the situation. Thus:—

"A Sepoy of the 5th N.I., fully armed and accoutred (he had fifty rounds of ammunition in his pouch), came and gave himself up to our picquet yesterday, saying that he was tired of life. He was hung. . . . The rope broke twice; the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

second time the bystanders laughed, *and he laughed too*. Three volleys put an end to his existence."

Again:

"On picquet yesterday Evans caught a venomous snake. . . . . He made the reptile bite his cap, and then seized it by the back of the neck, and, holding it tight, exposed its awfully sharp and venomous fangs most richly to view. The cool way in which he held it and poked its mouth about amused me much. He is fond of stalking musk-rats round the walls of the house, pouncing on their necks with his finger and thumb with great dexterity. He and Goldie have been amusing themselves with blowing up with powder thousands of flies (Aug. 5, 1857). . . . . .

"Evans took the opportunity of going to sleep in a puddle. He is the strongest man I know. Yesterday he was two hours up to his breast in water under a burning sun surrounded by alligators, which he was attempting to catch by their noses. He has only got a slight cold to-day (Aug. 18, 1857)."

Major Anson was under no illusion as to the difficulties in taking Delhi, and offers many shrewd criticisms on his leaders. He reflects also the feeling of neglect from home. On August 11th he writes: "They do not yet appear at home to have their eyes half open to the gravity of the crisis." And on the 27th: "We shall not be, humanly speaking, much indebted to the good people at home for the happy result of our exertions and endurance before Delhi. Their apathy, culpable in the extreme, seems to reign supreme, and they will require to hear the news of the fearful Cawnpore massacre before shaking it off." On August 29th he prospects the new *régime*:

"We cannot do without a small native army, especially on the frontier beyond Peshawar; but the new native army will be as small as we can make it, and there will be no monsters of Poorbeas in it. It will also be much more strongly officered and disciplined, and under the strictest surveillance of an army of Europeans double its present strength. Strong fortifications will be built at the principal stations, and powerful brigades kept as movable columns, ready to march at an hour's notice. This, you will see, will be the new *régime* when the present troubles are over."

If the volume be taken just for what it professes to be, it will be found of much personal and collateral interest.

MYTHS AND FOLK-LORE.

Chips from a German Workshop. By F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. New Edition. Vol. IV.: Essays on Mythology and Folk-Lore. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

This thick volume completes the "New Edition" of Professor Max Müller's famous collection of "Chips from a German Workshop," and very appropriately the workshop is figured in the frontispiece. The articles date at various periods from 1855 downwards. They deal with classical, Teutonic, Celtic, Zulu, and Oceanian myths and tales and songs, treating Mythology and Folk-Lore in the widest sense, and the alterations introduced now by the author seldom go beyond mistakes and misprints, although we think that he ought to have made the revision more thorough, without regard to the claims of existing stereotype plates. Here, however, as in the preceding volumes, Professor Max Müller maintains his old positions with tranquil satisfaction. He has re-read his early theories in the light of more recent, widely different, and largely hostile theories, and calmly announces that he has very little indeed to recant. Yet he is indulgent to other explorers of the same field. He acknowledges the persuasive charm of their theories; he is far less inclined now than he was in his more combative days to say that the views of those who differ from him are "altogether erroneous." Yes; "it may seem at first sight very strange that scholars working on the same materials, and all equally anxious, it may fairly be supposed, for the discovery of truth, should have arrived at such divergent, not to say contradictory, conclusions as to the origin and true purport of mythology." Still, "after watching the conflict of opinion for many years," he is at present rather inclined to say: "How could it be otherwise?" He even banters Mr. Andrew Lang with perfect complacency. It is the attitude of the philosophic mind that the years bring with them. The Professor has done his work to the best of his ability, and he is content to leave it to the judgment of the future.

"Truth is in no hurry." That is a great fact, which eager solvers of knotty problems are but too apt to forget. Approaching the mountain from different points, explorers necessarily report different observations, which may eventually turn out to be not discordant but really mutually supporting. There is no reason in the world why the various principles of interpretation should not be worked out independently. The only requirement of science is that every student should labour with a single eye to the truth, and criticise his fellows in the spirit of fairness. On this point, Professor Max Müller has certainly large ground for complaint. It is too absurd to call out Solar Myth when his name is mentioned.

"That there is hardly a mythology without Solar Myths, who would deny? That there is hardly anything else in mythology, who would affirm? Yet, because some of my earliest contributions to comparative mythology were devoted exclusively to the subject of Solar Myths, I have been represented again and again, even by Mr. Gladstone, as a Solarist, as teaching that the whole of mythology is solar. Suppose an astronomer were to write a book on the sun, would he be supposed to have denied the existence of the moon and the stars? Would other astronomers accuse him of ignorance, and claim for themselves the credit of having made the brilliant discovery of the moon and the stars in the sky?"

The remonstrance and the *reductio ad absurdum* ought not to have been necessary. Professor Max Müller, while working on the linguistic basis, has always had "the strongest sympathy for that more comprehensive spirit which animates the analogical and ethnological schools of comparative mythology." Knowing, however, the mistakes to which scholars are liable in analysing Vedic, Avestic, Greek, Roman and Teutonic mythology, after large familiarity with the languages and literature in which such mythology is embodied, he naturally shrinks from a confident handling of the folk-lore of peoples whose languages he has not studied. He enumerates and comments upon the six critical points of controversy put forward on behalf of the ethnologists by Mr. Andrew Lang; and certainly there is in each of these groups of comments serious matter to be answered. At the same time, he is most willing to admit that every one of the six points "contains some truth, and the system, if care-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

fully worked, as it has been, for instance, by Mr. Frazer, can produce and has produced very valuable results." The point of quarrel is the representation that the anthropologic system is "the only solvent of mythology in all parts of the world." "That," says Professor Max Müller emphatically, and with justice, "it certainly is not." In regard to the defence of his own position, he deals with the allegation that "etymology is often uncertain, and that comparison has sometimes proved misleading." Thus:—

"Does not the same apply in an even higher degree to the deciphering of Babylonian and Egyptian inscriptions, of Vedic hymns and Avestic Gâthas? nay, to every branch of science that is not absolutely stagnant? Does it not apply even to Physical Sciences, which like to call themselves exact? Does not Weismann differ from Darwin? Were Lord Kelvin and Huxley always agreed, even in facts and figures? Etymologies allow, at all events, of argument: we can produce our reasons for or against an etymology; we are not obliged to submit to mere authority. Those who cannot form an opinion for themselves would naturally keep aloof. Nor would any mythologist trust to etymology and comparison by themselves, without looking for further help and confirmation."

The thing is to get at the *hyponoia*, the thoughts underlying every myth, the reason in all the unreason of mythology. It must be acknowledged that Professor Max Müller has done his fair share of the work of discovery on the lines of the oldest available evidence, the evidence of language. From the preface to the present volume we learn, incidentally, that he has yet another work on the stocks, dealing with points of argument on which scholars have differed from him. He certainly displays a breadth of view and a largeness of scientific conception that are absolutely essential to solid achievement. Whatever dissents may be made from particular opinions, he still holds the field with doughty determination. "With such names as Bopp, Burnouf, Benfey, and Pott, among the ancients, and Darmesteter, Michel Bréal, von Bradke, Oldenberg, Bloomfield, and Victor Henry, among the present generation, to support me, the time has not yet come to strike our flag."

INDIAN STORIES.

Silent Gods and Sun-Steeped Lands. By R. W. FRAZER, LL.B., I.C.S., Retired. Illustrated by A. D. MCCORMICK. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

The half-dozen short stories that form this exquisitely printed little volume all deal with variations of one simple theme—the depth of elemental passion or of long inherited superstition in the Eastern mind. The first, "The Tailless Tiger," is a grim story of the murderous revenge of a jealous husband on a Brahman priest. The murderer perishes mysteriously in the forest, killed apparently by the spirit of the dead transformed into a tailless tiger. "The Cry from the River" introduces the belief that strength and stability may be given to a bridge or other building by burying a living person in its foundations. "The Wail of the Woman" tells the mournful story of the daughter of a Brahman priest who ventured, under the protection of English law, to marry, although, as a "child-widow," she was doomed by the law of her caste to perpetual widowhood. "The Last Human Sacrifice and the Abbé Leroux" is the longest and also distinctly the best story in the book. It is based on the superstition described in Volume I of "The Golden Bough" (pp. 384–390), the belief in the magical power of the blood and tears of a human victim to fertilise the land, the blood causing the redness of the turmeric and the tears producing rain. The scene is laid among the wild hill-tribes of the Khonds, and the introduction amongst these of the worship of the lowland goddess Kali is the central point of the narrative. In these four slight, somewhat monotonous, and yet impressive stories, and to a less degree in the remainder of his volume, Mr. Frazer is chiefly successful in conveying to the reader his deep sense of the great mysteries of India—the mysteries of Nature, of wide river and vast hill and pathless jungle, and the greater mysteries of the people, "the wild, silent passion that rages in the hearts" of those whose gods the European has broken in pieces. He paints in truly sombre colours; there is hardly a touch of hopefulness, or even of humour, to lighten the gloom. But he writes with a real endeavour to understand and enter into the feelings he describes. The style suffers from a defect often to be noticed in first books (as this presumably is)—a tendency to overweight the sentences with trailing relative clauses. The interminable relatives of "The House that Jack Built" ought to be taken as a warning rather than as a model. Mr. McCormick's effective illustrations deserve a word of praise; their dim outlines and shadowy suggestiveness admirably reflect the spirit of the narrative.

"TWENTY-ONE DAYS IN INDIA."

Twenty-One Days in India. Being the Tour of Sir Ali Baba, K.C.B. By GEORGE ABERIGH-MACKAY. (W. and H. Allen and Co., Limited.)

Sir Ali Baba spends his twenty-one days in India in calling on a varied circle of acquaintances, from the Viceroy, the "Great Ornamental," to the Indian Villager, by way, of course, of the Travelling M.P. The sketches are light and readable, a decided change from the hackneyed commonplaces with regard to Indian life with which we are so painfully familiar. But they are very unequal, and sometimes spoilt by too obvious a desire to be funny. The characters may be classified broadly as those who are admitted to Simla, those who visit Darjiling, and those who go nowhere at all. By a subtle process of evolution it is possible to pass from the second class to the first. The collector is a case in point. When every illusion as to the desirability of the English climate and the superiority of his English friends has vanished, "when the afternoon of life is throwing longer shadows, the Acheron of promotion is gaping before him, he falls into a commissionership, into an officiating seat on the Board of Revenue. *Facilis descensus*, etc. Nothing will save him now: transmigration has set in; the gates of Simla fly open. It is all over." The last class, it is needless to say, does not evolve. The author is for once serious as he talks of the Indian villager. "Famine is his horizon, insufficient food the foreground. And this is the more extraordinary since the villager is

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

surrounded by a dreamland of plenty. Everywhere you see fields flooded with millet and wheat. The village and its old trees have to climb on to a knoll to keep their feet out of the gorgeous poppy and the luscious sugar-cane. Amid this easeful and luxurious splendour the villager labours and starves." But even for him there is some compensation. Nature exhibits to him all her charms. "In that mysterious temple of the Dawn, in which we of noisy mess-rooms, heated courts and dusty offices are infrequent worshippers, the peasant is a priest. Day, with its fierce glories, brings the throbbing silence of intense life and under-flickering shade, amid the soft pulsations of Nature, the cultivator lives his day-dream. What there is of squalour and drudgery and carking care in his life melts into a brief oblivion, and he is a man in the presence of his God, with the holy stillness of Nature brooding over him." But such is not the general tenour of the book, which points out in a flippant fashion the unnecessary pomps and vanities, the superfluous quantities of gold lace and chuprassies, which attend the Government in India. The present (twentieth) edition contains some new sketches, which are scarcely up to the level of the rest. It also contains copies of the illustrations from the larger edition, some of which are rather amusing.

THE SECOND JUNGLE BOOK.

The Second Jungle Book. By RUDYARD KIPLING. With decorations by J. LOCKWOOD KIPLING, C.I.E. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

Mr. Kipling has kept his promise, made in the "Jungle Book," and given us another equally delightful volume of stories. It is marked by the same accurate and subtle observation and imaginative force which carries the reader away and adds these beasts of the jungle to the number of his familiar acquaintance. The characters of the various animals are so skilfully depicted that one seems in reading the book to have entered a new Æsop world where the parts are played by the panther, the cobra, and the elephant, and the wisdom they enforce is none the less homely and direct, if a little less obvious, than in the old-fashioned stories. Certainly the brown bear and the panther deserve to be added to the list of those names which have been recalled from vague generality and endowed with personality. Mowgli has become the master of the jungle, whose power all acknowledge, even Hathi the wild elephant. He lives among the jungle people, abiding by their law, to that last law which all must obey, when the drought brings famine and desolation, when the spring comes in which "the *mohewa* tree, that Baloo was so fond of, never flowered. Then, inch by inch, the untempered heat crept into the heart of the jungle, turning it yellow, brown, and at last black. The green growths in the sides of the ravines burned up to broken wires and curled films of dead stuff; the hidden pools sank down and caked over, keeping the last beast footmark on their edges as if it had been cast in iron; the juicy-stemmed creepers fell away from the trees they clung to and died at their feet; the bamboos withered, clanking when the hot winds blew; and the moss peeled off the rocks deep in the jungle, till they were as bare and hot as the quivering blue-boulders in the bed of the stream." The most exciting of all the stories relates the great fight between the wolves and the dholes or red dogs of the Dekkan. The latter are so fearless that every animal quails before them. In a huge pack they wander forth searching for food and slaying all they meet. The account of Mowgli's successful cunning, and the final struggle, is most vividly told. But "man goes back to man at last, though the jungle does not cast him out." The time of new song, and the joy of good hunting, cease to satisfy Mowgli, and he returns to lead the life of a villager. A few graphic touches make us realise with what bitterness of spirit he was forced to leave his old, happy, careless life, and how inevitable it was that he should be so forced. There is also a humorous character-sketch of a crocodile and a jackal, the story of Purun Bhagat whose hero no other country than India could ever have furnished, and a few other stories. The verses scattered at intervals share the fascinating rhythm of most of Mr. Kipling's work of this kind, though none of them perhaps is quite so irresistible as the march of the camp animals in the earlier book.

THE STORY OF THE SEA.

The Story of the Sea. Edited by Q, assisted by Professor J. K. Laughton, H. O. Arnold-Forster, M.P., W. Laird Clowes, Herbert W. Wilson, etc., etc. Illustrated. Volume I.: Cassell and Co. (London, Paris and Melbourne, 1895).

All who have had a share in the production of this handsome volume deserve well of the public. The distinguished editor (who is not familiar with the name of that writer of delightful stories and no less delightful *causeries*, Mr. A. T. Quiller-Couch?) and his expert assistants have been generously seconded by the enterprising publishers, Messrs. Cassell and Co., and the result is a harmonious and beautiful compilation which should prove fascinating not only to young men and maidens but also to very many children of a larger growth. "You are an English boy," says the writer of the introductory article, "with good adventurous blood in you, and you are rightly eager to know something of the story of the sea, to examine that inheritance which covers nearly three-fourths of our planet and is perhaps the chief glory of your blood and State. The subject, of course, is really inexhaustible, and nothing short of a grand encyclopædia could pretend to do it justice. These pages do but undertake to give you a lively sketch of the sea, its nature and its mysteries, and of man's high performances upon it." The task is as colossal as it must be exhilarating. The present volume ranges from "Sailing Vessels and their Rigs," to "Tales of Bombardment and Blockade," from "The Pleasures of the Sea: Yatching," to "The Lifeboat at Work." It contains also hundreds of excellent illustrations.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"THE RELIEF OF CHITRAL."

The Relief of Chitral. By Captain G. J. YOUNGHUSBAND (Queen's Corps of Guides) and Captain FRANK E. YOUNGHUSBAND, C.I.E., Indian Staff Corps (Late Political Officer in Chitral). With Map and Illustrations. (London: Macmillan and Co., and at New York. 1895.)

"This book is the joint production of two brothers who are constantly being mistaken for one another." They are at the time of writing both Captains, were both intimately concerned in the campaign of which Chitral fort was the objective, and are now both officers in the Indian Army, though one began his career in the British Service. Captain Frank E. Younghusband, C.I.E, is in the Political Service of the Government of India. Captain G. J. Younghusband is a combatant officer in that noted Punjab corps the Queen's Own Guides. The heroic exertions, the sustained endurance, and the military skill displayed in the several events of which the relief of Chitral was the objective, come naturally under three divisions of the narrative—the expedition sent from India under General Sir Robert Lowe; the defence of the Chitral fort by Surgeon-Major Robertson and the commandant Captain Colin Campbell, with comrades Townshend and Baird; and the amazing march of Colonel Kelly with his 400 Sikh and Kashmir troops, who really raised the siege and relieved Chitral. As to the form of the joint narrative, the skill and care with which it is told is in no respect more manifest than in the success with which these three distinct operations are described without cross references or repetition. The composition is generally excellent, while the brief notices of the striking scenery through which the several actors moved in no way encumber the story, and it goes without saying that the topography and the delineation of the various military operations leave little to be desired. Justice is also done to such plans and strategy as Umra Khan and Sher Afzul had arranged between them, much of this being derived from the information and observations noted by Lieutenants Fowler and Edwardes during their eventful captivity, which was terminated by their well-timed strategic release when the shrewd Pathan chief promoted them from the status of prisoners to that of envoys, with good results to himself. The story of these officers' "treacherous" seizure and rough usage on the polo ground at Reshan, the hardships and perils of their enforced march as prisoners, the sagacity of Umra Khan in his treatment of, and tentative negotiations with, them (pp. 39-52) form one of the less known but more interesting portions of this strange eventful history of the whole conflict in the recesses of the Hindu Kush. Here we may quote the author's epitome of this episode:

"So ended the wonderful adventures of these two British subalterns. At the time when they were holding out at Ruston and making their last stand in a mere village house against overwhelming numbers of the enemy; again when they were treacherously captured by a deceitful foe; and, lastly, when they were in the hands of men in the fever heat of rebellion against the British, no one could have supposed that they could have escaped alive. But they had survived every peril and were now once more in safety among their fellow-countrymen."

Whilst there are decorations and promotions for survivors no one can forget the brave men who were sacrificed in this "brilliant" military effort to redeem the desperate and ill-omened political policy in which this campaign was one of the deplorable incidents. One of the most conspicuous and pathetic of these sacrifices was that of Captain J. McD. Baird in the memorable sortie from the Fort. A fine portrait of him is given in this volume. Captain Younghusband does justice to the gallant young officer (pp. 169-171). He says:

"A week after Colonel Kelly had reached Chitral, Major 'Roddy' Owen and myself, riding on ahead of the advanced parties of General Lowe's force, arrived in Chitral. . . . Late in the evening of April 27th we rode in and had the honour to be the first to congratulate the famous garrison and the officers of Colonel Kelly's force upon their splendid achievements. . . . One of the first subjects on which they spoke to us was about poor Baird. Few officers have ever attached their comrades to them more sincerely than this brave officer, and he was one of the best and keenest soldiers in the service. . . . His coolness was as remarkable as his zeal; and suffering though he was and knowing that he must die he remained cheerful and collected to the last. . . . He gave a few last messages to those at home, and then with a smile on his face, and, thinking of his profession to the very end, wished his comrades success in their plans and bade them good-bye. He died on the morning of March the 4th, and was buried in the dead of night outside the main gate of the fort while the enemy were firing all round."

It was two months later when General Gatacre read a funeral service over his grave, and Major Aylmer, R.E., "erected a tombstone to his memory, and with his own hands carved an inscription upon it." Here we may not unfittingly add Captain Younghusband's testimony to the living in a different rank:

"After poor Baird I think the subject on which the officers of the garrison spoke most feelingly was the devotion and noble spirit of discipline and determination shown by the Sikhs. There were but a hundred of them in a garrison of nearly four hundred; but the officers said without them they could never have held out, and that but for these Sikhs not one of them would have been there now."

Much more in detail will be read in the book—where is also a very successful photographic picture of the "Company of the 14th Sikhs," which is good to see.

It would be out of question for us to venture a single criticism on the military incidents of the campaign. But the bravest soldier may still doubt whether it was wise on March 2nd to send out "a reconnoitring force," consisting of so large

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES, SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS.—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a portion of the garrison, when hostilities between the British and the Chitralis had not yet commenced. Far be it from us to undervalue the judgment of Surgeon-Major Robertson and his commandant, Captain Colin Campbell; but surely there was lack of adequate information as to the enemy's position, and utter disaster was only averted by Lieutenant Harley and his fifty Sikhs' gallant and successful covering of the retreat. The description of that offensive and defensive engagement (p.100-8) is one of the best in the book, comprising as it does the thrilling incident of Dr. Whitchurch's noble rescue of the mortally wounded Baird. But, after all, it reminds one of the disastrous results—on a larger field—of the sorties from Agra and Lucknow in the great revolt, which, in each case, brought on close investment, as happened in the case of Chitral.

The gallant authors have no responsibility for the ugly business of which the beleaguerment of a British Indian officer, beyond the Himalaya, became so striking a demonstration. The reckless policy, of which this was one inevitable result, began long before they came on the scene. Yet as the final chapter of the book, "The Present Situation," gives a sort of challenge, it must be noticed. The line taken in the plea on behalf of the retention of Chitral proceeds on the usual fallacy—here we are, what else can we do? This question must, by men with a due sense of responsibility, be answered by another—how, and why did the Indian Government get itself into that false position? That question, one that is equivalent to an indictment, has been answered in every shape and form in former issues of this journal. It is idle for those whose advice or weak concurrence has plunged the Indian Empire into interminable difficulties, far beyond its frontiers, to try to excuse themselves by the existence of the difficulties they have themselves created. There is no fatality in the situation, save the semblance thereof, which they have wantonly incurred and evoked. It is vain for them to be constantly and cunningly begging the question; for, though current Indian history is systematically obscured by persistent sequestration of State papers and dexterous evasion of personal responsibility, the truth must come out. The only safe and conservative course, consistently followed under the Governor-Generals from Canning to Mayo and Northbrook, has been abundantly vindicated in its wisdom by the catastrophes, the confusion, and the intolerable waste of Indian resources that have followed from its violation. All these disastro is results that have followed, of which the siege of Chitral with its costly campaign form a striking object lesson, confirm to the very letter every warning, every prediction recorded during the time of the strong men up to 1875, which has been followed, to the ruin of India, by the *régime* of military adventurers, of sciolists, and fevered strategists.

Two illustrations of the *impasse* into which our Indian Empire has been thrust we may take from this volume. On p. 13 is given a sketch of Umra Khan of Gandul, the "enterprising chief," the "uncontrollable spirit," against whom the Indian Government (ostensibly) organised a huge expedition into the fastnesses of High Asia. But who fed the "ambitions" of this Pathan brigand, and enabled him to pursue this "series of wars against his neighbours (the Amír of Kabul included) which only culminated in the disasters of the present year?" Who, indeed, but the Indian Government itself, alternately commended or weakly deprecated by successive Secretaries of State? More than three years ago ample warning was given in these columns of the mischief being wrought by this marauding chief whom the Simla Foreign Office used as its catspaw and congenial instrument. But our few independent public men were too busy to attend to the real dangers of the Indian Empire. The other illustration we take from the volume is the map which shows, in little, (*a*) the true statutory boundary of India, and (*b*) the immense tract of barren mountains which the Indian Government vainly affects to bring under its "Political Control," at a cost to India in revenues, credit, and reputation which no one in England has yet realised.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

DECEMBER, 1895.

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). The Editor, "Girls' Schools in the Madras Presidency." Irvine, W., "Sir Robert Sandeman and the Indian Frontier." "The Mysore State."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Griffin, Sir Lepel, "Kashmir."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

DECEMBER, 1895.

"RAM BUX"....."Boojum Ballads." (Nutt) Paper	Rs.2.8
ANSON, BREVET-MAJOR O. H. S. G. ....."With H. M. 9th Lancers during the Indian Mutiny." (W. H. Allen)	7s. 6d.
ALI, SYED AMEER, C.I.E. ....."The Spirit of Islam; or the Life and Teachings of Muhammad." (W. H. Allen & Co.).....	12s. 0d.
MCMILLAN, ALEC ....."Divers Ditties, chiefly written in India." (Constable)	
WILSON, SIR ROLAND KNYVET, L.L.M. ....."A Digest of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." (Thacker & Co.)	— —
GORE, F. St. J. ....."Lights and Shades of Hill Life in the Afghan and Hindu Highlands of the Punjab." (John Murray)	31s. 6d.
ROY, SUNDARI BULA.....Acwamedha and Acramavisika Parva." (Bhârata Press, Calcutta)	— —
JOHNSTONE, MAJOR-GENERAL SIR JAMES, K.C.S.I. .. "My Experiences in Manipur and the Naga Hills." (Sampson Low)	— —
MCCORMICK, A. D. ....."An Artist in the Himalayas." (Fisher Unwin)	16s. 0d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION— India: Final Examination—September, 1895	1s. 0d.
India, Civil Service of, and Clerkships, Class I, August, 1895.....	1s. 0d.

Printed by A. RONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 2. (NEW SERIES.)] FEBRUARY, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	33
The Judiciary and the Executive in India:	
I.—By the Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse	39
II.—By the Right Hon. Sir Richard Couch	40
III.—By Sir Robert T. Reid, Q.C., M.P.	40
IV.—By Sir William Markby	41
V.—By Sir Raymond West	41
Uitlanders and India: The Mote and the Beam, by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P.	41
Wanted: Reform of the Councils	43
Lord Elgin at Madras	45
The Duty of Educated India: Speech by Mr. P. M. Mehta	46
The Congress at Poona	49
The President's Address	50
The Social Conference	52
A Challenge from Madras	54
Our London Letter	55
The Indian National Congress: Eleventh Session	57
,, ,, Text of the Resolutions	58
,, ,, "A Means of Learning Something"	61
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the Crisis	62
Reviews: Poor India	62
A Gujarati Grammar	64
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	64

Indiana.

The Poona Congress.

The proceedings of the eleventh Indian National Congress and of the Social Conference take up, in one form or another, a large part of our present issue. To print reports of the speeches was, of course, impossible, but we reproduce the text of the resolutions which were carried, together with a descriptive sketch of the proceedings from our Special Correspondent. Articles will also be found elsewhere dealing with Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji's presidential address, and the chief features both of the National Congress and of the Social Conference. We have endeavoured thus to present in concise form a general survey of the great annual assembly of educated India. The articles to which we have referred will gain by being read in connexion with Sir W. Wedderburn's article upon Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta's speech, and the extracts which we quote from the speech itself. It will be seen that one of the most important resolutions carried by the Congress urged once more the separation of judicial and executive functions. Upon this subject, in continuation of previous articles, we print the opinions of eminent authorities who have kindly consented to the publication of their statements in the Memorandum that is to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India.

Mr. Banerji on Finance.

We deal elsewhere with the general features of the comprehensive address delivered by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji as President of the Eleventh Congress. We may notice here the large portion of the address which deals with finance. Upon this subject, which undoubtedly lies at the root of India's difficulties, Mr. Banerji, representing as he does the universal sentiments of educated Indians, expressed himself with cogency and precision. The truth is that at present there is no effective check either in India or in the House of Commons upon the expenditure incurred by the Government of India. "If," Mr. Banerji said, "there is one thing more than another which English constitutional history impresses upon the mind of the reader, it is the zealous solicitude which the English people show at every stage of their history to ensure to their representatives, and to them alone, the full and absolute control over the finances of the country." On the other hand, the discussion of the Indian Budget is little more than a dismal farce. In India, members of Council may indeed discuss the Budget. But no resolution may be moved, no division may be taken, and the novel theory of the "mandate" lays down the doctrine that members must follow, not the dictates of their judgment, but the instructions of the Secretary of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

State. The unreality of the discussion is even more marked in the House of Commons. The Indian Budget is presented as a foregone conclusion, it is discussed in a thin House at the eleventh hour of an expiring Session, and, even if the resolution that is submitted were not, as it is, purely formal, it is too late to remedy mischief which has been done. The results of this system are such as might be expected. Mr. Banerji summed up in a trenchant passage the financial history of the sixty years from 1834 to 1894. "During this period you have had," he said, "thirty-four years of deficit amounting in round numbers to 83 crores of rupees, and twenty-six years of surplus amounting to 42 crores of rupees in round numbers, with the net result that you have a net deficit of about 41 crores of rupees which make an average of deficit of something over 65 lakhs of rupees a year. Our debt kept pace with our deficit. They are twin sisters which march abreast. During the same period the public debt increased from 26 crores to 210 crores and 42 crores of this amount were incurred within the last ten years. If we are not bankrupts at any rate we are on the high road to bankruptcy." Yet the question which occupies the Government of India is not how to curtail unproductive, and especially military, expenditure but how to raise larger revenues to bury in the quicksands.

The Home Charges.

As for the Home Charges, Mr. Banerji pointed out that between 1882 and 1892 they had increased by more than 30 per cent. This is a subject which will occupy the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and the members of that body will doubtless notice Mr. Banerji's complaint that charges are thrown upon India which should be borne, wholly or in part, by the British Treasury. "Charges," he said, "are thrown upon us which in the case of the free and independent colonies are borne by the Home Government. We paid £500,000 for the construction of the India Office in London. The Home Government paid £100,000 for the construction of the Colonial Office in London. Can anybody tell me why the Colonial Office cost £100,000 in the construction, and the India Office £500,000? Did it make any difference that the one was paid for out of our money and the other out of the money of the English taxpayer, who can look after his purse and can control the public expenditure? But let us proceed. We pay all the charges of the India Office in London amounting to £230,000 a year. The Home Government pays £41,000 for the Colonial Office in London. We pay £12,500 a year for the maintenance of the Chinese Legation, and £7,000 a year for the Persian Legation. The cost of the Residency in Turkish Arabia and of the Consulate in Bagdad, amounting to Rs.1,72,360, is entirely paid from the Indian revenues, as if England in her Imperial relations was in no way interested in their maintenance." The effect of such inequitable charges as these, combined as they are with continued extravagance in the Civil and Military departments of the Government of India, is, of course, to starve expenditure in directions in which it is urgently needed. Mr. Banerji cited, for example, some remarkable statistics showing how meagre is the expenditure on education in India compared with other countries. He finds that "while the expenditure on education per head of the population in Ceylon is over 2 ans., in Mauritius it is 10 ans., in Natal 1s. 3d., in British Guiana it is 1s. 11d., and even in Russia it is 3½d., in India it is only a little over 7 pies." How long will the supineness of British constituencies permit this scandal to continue?

Mr. Mehta's Speech.

We should like to think that the remarkable speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on December 20th will receive in this country, from members of Parliament and others, the careful attention which it so well deserves. The occasion was such as might well evoke the best qualities of so accomplishd an orator. The Indian community of Bombay thronged to the theatre to present to Mr. Mehta two addresses which had been voted to him some months before by the citizens of Bombay and by the delegates of the Eighth Bombay Provincial Conference. We learn from the Bombay newspapers that the meeting was thoroughly representative, and that so large an assembly had seldom been seen in the city. The addresses, voted to Mr. Mehta on his return from the sittings of the Imperial Legislative Council at Calcutta, testified in eloquent terms to the esteem and gratitude which his public services have won for him among all classes of his fellow-countrymen. Whether as the champion of municipal reform in Bombay, the advocate of higher education, or the vigilant critic of Imperial measures of a reactionary and repressive type, Mr. Mehta has never ceased in his efforts to "promote in every way the welfare of his countrymen and improve their political status.' His name has been associated with most of the public movements in India during the past twenty-five years, and his services in the Imperial Legislative Council, especially in explaining the true causes of India's financial embarrassments, in defending healthy parliamentary interest in the affairs of India, and in resisting the odious provisions of such measures as the Police Amendment Bill, have marked him out as one of the most brilliant exponents of independent public opinion.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Needless to say, Mr. Mehta has always taken a leading part in the work of the Indian National Congress and, as the delegates of the Provincial Conference point out, when that first great triumph of the Congress, the reform of the Legislative Councils, was obtained, he was chosen with one accord to be the representative of Bombay in the Local as well as the Imperial Councils.

The Task of Educated India.

Mr. Mehta's speech, which was received throughout with enthusiastic applause, may be described as an eloquent justification of the part which educated Indians are more and more tending to play, either as officials or as non-official critics, in the government of their country. With the modesty which is characteristic of him he accepted the addresses, not as a compliment personal to himself, but as setting forth "the motives which actuate the conduct of educated men throughout the country, the principles which guide their action, the credentials which they possess, and the constituents which they can, if not scientifically and systematically, at any rate really and substantially represent." It is fashionable in certain quarters to denounce as agitators or to ridicule as busybodies educated Indians who seek to represent the wants and wishes of the Indian people. Mr. Bhownaggree, whose pretensions have excited amusement in India, has joined in this chorus of vague and fatuous rebuke. Unfortunately, as Mr. Mehta showed in an entertaining anecdote, Mr. Bhownaggree appears to have held quite opposite opinions no long time ago. The people of India are merely bewildered by the attention which this versatile critic seems to receive in some circles. They have recognised only one Indian as having the right to make a representative claim for all India, namely, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Mr. Mehta spoke with enthusiasm of the advantages which have accrued to India from the spread of education. "From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone issued a band of noble youths, thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, to make the foreign rule of the country in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence a blessing to them both, instead of a curse." Nothing could be more absurd than to suggest that, because India is conservative, its administration cannot be improved. It is, as Mr. Mehta said, idle to talk of letting the aboriginal conservatism of India alone, for the simple reason that it is permeated already by the inevitable results of foreign rule. The problem is "how to reconcile them to a harmonious evolution," and this problem increasingly demands the watchful energies of educated Indians.

Bureaucratic "Aloofness."

Some Anglo-Indians appear to think, in the phrase of John Bright, that, having won India by breaking all the Ten Commandments, they cannot at this time of day begin to maintain it on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. The danger which Mr. Mehta perceives is not that the policy laid down in 1858 may be openly reversed, but that it will be insidiously evaded. British rule in India, however excellent it may be in many respects, is too secret, and the authorities are too little in touch with the people. Indeed, men like Sir Charles Elliott and Lord Harris appear to maintain that knowledge of public sentiments and needs resides solely and permanently in District Officers. It is the part of educated Indians to prevent the dangers which a bureaucratic system of this kind tends to produce. They know, as Englishmen can never know, the authentic wishes of the Indian peoples. They can speak their language, they mix freely among them, and, as Mr. Mehta put it, the hearts of the people are open to them as they can never be even to the most sympathetic officer. Heaven-born bureaucrats are fond of saying that educated Indians are a class apart, that they congregate in the large towns, and that they are utterly ignorant of the feelings and thoughts of the mass of the people. This statement has only one disadvantage, but it is a serious one. It is precisely the reverse of the truth. The majority of educated Indians are drawn from the small towns and villages, they have grown up in friendly contact with all sections of the agricultural and commercial classes, and they represent not only their own kith and kin but also a great body of public opinion which cannot at present find any other means of expression. This is specially true of the delegates who, taken together, constitute that unrivalled exponent of Indian opinion—the Indian National Congress. Mr. Mehta said a plain word about the native princes and chiefs. Undoubtedly they are in sympathy with the aims and objects of educated India, but "they do not always give open expresssion to their views for fear of displeasing their political officers who have it in their power to harass them in a hundred different ways." Men like Mr. Mehta are better representatives of Indian opinion than any political officers, and a Government which should wilfully close its ears against the advice and warnings of such counsellors

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

would be going out of its way to court disaster. Happily there is reason to believe that this ostrich-like policy is coming to be regarded with less and less favour by the Government of India.

Lord Reay and Lord Sandhurst.

Anglo-Indians who roundly abuse all independent Indian criticism of officials are, in fact, deprecating praise as well as blame. Public opinion in India is nothing if not discriminating. It does not by any means place all Anglo-Indian authorities in the same category with Sir Charles Elliott and Lord Harris. Lord Elgin, Liberal and Home Ruler though he is, has recently incurred some well-merited censure. But with Lord Sandhurst, the successor of Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay, the case is different. Mr. Mehta, for example, in the impressive speech from which we quote elsewhere, referred, amid loud cheers, to Lord Sandhurst's speeches as "distinguished by a genial and sympathetic tact which seems to win for his lordship all hearts wherever he goes." Similarly a Bombay correspondent writes to us under date December 20th :—"Lord Sandhurst yesterday unveiled the statue of Lord Reay, our former beloved Governor. After Elphinstone and Frere we have had no such Governor—a man of great culture, of stern rectitude, and of warm sympathy for Indians, who unswervingly upheld in practice, amid much obloquy from his own countrymen, the righteous principles laid down in the gracious proclamation of 1858. Lord Sandhurst made a speech which was not only full of just eulogy for his friend, but also expressed his own warm sympathy with the views of Lord Reay. Lord Sandhurst is extremely felicitous in his public utterances. His simplicity and engaging frankness at once kindles sympathy in the hearts of his hearers. In the speech which he delivered at the laying of the foundation-stone of the municipal offices at Karachi, he said candidly that a Governor's tour was not a mere show, but implied a desire to understand not only the public officials, but also enlighted non-official opinion." Is this the sort of criticism which, in Sir Charles Elliott's judgment, impairs the "prestige" of the Government of India?

The Cotton Duties.

The long expected readjustment of the Indian cotton duties has come at last, and it seems to have pleased nobody. Sir James Westland introduced in the Legislative Council at Calcutta on January 23rd two Bills providing for the total exemption of cotton yarns from import and excise duty, the reduction of the import duty on woven cottons from 5 to 3½ per cent., and the levying of an excise duty of 3½ per cent on goods woven in Indian mills. Sir James Westland, who has not hitherto been regarded as a humourist, protested against the bare notion that "the question in some way entered on a new phase or was in some way affected by the change of Ministry which took place in June last." He maintained that the policy of the Secretary of State, whether Lord George Hamilton or Sir Henry Fowler, had been "perfectly continuous" throughout. This is rather good. But it is not quite good enough. Sir Henry Fowler did, indeed, declare from the first that the cotton duties had, or should have, no protective effect. What Lord George Hamilton said last February was that the cotton duties were inexpedient and unjust, and that no excise duty could remove their injustice. He was then a private member. But he re-asserted his opinions in July as Secretary of State, and on the strength of them Conservative candidates triumphed throughout Lancashire. Yet Lord George Hamilton now has recourse to a general excise duty, in order to accomplish the purpose for which he then held, or stated, that an excise duty was useless. If this is continuous policy, there is no such thing as tergiversation. The result is that, while Lancashire manufacturers protest against the exemption of the products of hand-loom weaving in India, the Bombay millowners complain that the proposed alterations will reduce the duty on imported cotton goods from 125 to 88 lakhs, while the excise will be increased from 7 to 17½ lakhs—in other words, that the entire improvement in the finances of India is handed over to a reduction of the duties levied on Manchester goods. Meantime, the Indian taxpayer reflects, not without bitterness, that the salt tax is not reduced, although the Finance Minister, on his own admission, had 50 lakhs to spare.

A "Continuous" Policy!

It is interesting to contrast Mr. Balfour's references to the cotton duties, in his speech at Manchester on January 15th, with Lord George Hamilton's notorious speech of February last. Lord G. Hamilton declared, as we have seen, that the cotton duties were impolitic and inexpedient, unjust and unfair, and that a countervailing excise duty could not possibly remove the injustice. Mr. Balfour, whose candidature in East Manchester was aided last summer by Lord G. Hamilton's electioneering manifesto, declared that the Government would not fall behind its promises and expressions of intention. Its policy is, he said, "that as between Britain and India there shall be no protection either on one side or the other." Interpreting this remark by means of Lord G. Hamilton's formula, Sir W. H. Houldsworth, M.P., naturally inferred that the cotton duties were to be totally abolished. Mr. Balfour removed this erroneous inference, which

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

nevertheless illustrates once more the unscrupulousness with which many Conservatives have dealt with the whole question. The total abolition of the cotton duties, Mr. Balfour said, "is, for financial reasons, not at present possible. India must have money, and there is no other way to raise it than by a duty." If Lord G. Hamilton had said that last February, or written it last July, the representation of Lancashire in the House of Commons would be different from what it is. Undoubtedly Lancashire has suffered through the re-imposition of the duties. One has only to read such documents as the Annual Reports of the Weaver's Associations at Blackburn and Darwen in order to see that the complaints of Lancashire, though they may be exaggerated, are not without foundation. The pity of it is that Lancashire is apparently making little effort to understand or to remove the cause which led to the re-imposition of the duties. Mr. Balfour, who cultivates bimetallism as a student, though not as a Minister, roundly declared that it would never have been "needful to put an import duty at all in India upon Lancashire manufactures, had it not been for the unhappy fall in the gold value of silver." Has Mr. Balfour made any serious attempt to examine the facts? We have shown over and over again from the accounts of the Government of India that the chief cause of Indian financial embarrassment, and therefore of the re-imposition of the cotton duties, was not the fall in exchange, but extravagance in civil and military expenditure, and especially in the pursuit of the "forward" frontier policy. It would, no doubt, be unpleasant for Mr. Balfour to admit the truth of this proposition. He was one of the foremost advocates of the retention of Chitral, and he is a leading member of the party which invented the "forward" policy. But he may rest assured of one thing. So long as Lancashire electors return an overwhelming majority of representatives who support the "forward" military policy, they can expect to find little sympathy in India with their protests against the cotton duties.

In Praise of Publicity.

There was one remark in Mr. Balfour's speech at Manchester which the Government of India would do well to ponder. At the close of his references to the Venezuela question, he said, amid applause, "surely with all this mass of material before the public of both countries it will be hard indeed if the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race is not able to settle any point in dispute without the arbitrament of war." It is satisfactory to find Mr. Balfour admitting so frankly that, as we have always contended, publicity, not secrecy, is the best policy in international affairs. Rarely has the British Government been occupied with such a complication of diverse troubles abroad. But it is significant that, where the public have been taken into the confidence of the Government, the clouds are lifting, while the policy of secrecy and silence has been attended by unqualified failure. The prospect has greatly improved in the Transvaal business, where Mr. Chamberlain has worked openly, and in the Venezuela business, where President Cleveland's Message made the people of both countries the assessors of their Governments in determining the points at issue. But in the case of the Armenian question, where secrecy has been maintained for many years and by both parties, especially in the suppression of the Consular Reports, there is hardly a gleam of light and hope. The moral should not be lost upon bureaucrats. It is far easier for an individual Minister, however cordially he may detest the horrors of war, to bring about hostilities than it is for two peoples to enter upon war with full knowledge and of set purpose. In Indian affairs in particular we see some of the worst fruits of bureaucratic secrecy. The protracted series of diplomatic manœuvres which is known as the "forward" frontier policy and which, from time to time, finds vent in such an incident as the recent fighting in Chitral, is essentially a secret thing, and the machinations of which it consists could not stand the light of public knowledge. It depends upon the suppression of State papers, and the bowdlerisation of Blue-Books. To disclose it fully would be to destroy it, and to disgrace its authors and agents. It thrives in darkness, and apparently both political parties in the United Kingdom are content that it should so thrive. Lord Rosebery may complain on public platforms that the Chitral Blue-Book was too carefully edited. But if Sir H. Fowler had heeded the repeated requests of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, the most important documents would have been public property before his successor was appointed. Mr. Balfour admits the value of publicity under representative institutions, where members and Ministers can be called to account. It is not less, but more, necessary under a bureaucratic Government, where irresponsible officials are only too easily guided by their own sweet will.

The Finance Commission.

It is an open secret that the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, which will shortly resume its investigations at the India Office, has hitherto been occupied chiefly, if not exclusively, with what may be described as the financial machinery of the Government of India, as distinguished from the progress of expenditure, and the apportionment of charge between India and the United Kingdom. The

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

proclamation appointing the Commission expressly contemplated the issue of *interim* reports, and such a subject as financial machinery obviously lends itself to separate treatment. The evidence which has been taken by the Commission is, in pursuit of a policy which we have always deplored, withheld from the public. But it is inconceivable that some, at any rate, of the financial experts who have been called should not have strengthened the demands and representations consistently put forward by educated Indians and British advocates of Indian reform. So far as financial machinery is concerned, those representations have always emphasised the absence of any real and effective check upon Indian expenditure. Such a check is not to be found either in India or in the House of Commons, and it is not surprising that, as we show elsewhere, a large part of the Presidential Address at the Poona Congress was taken up with a discussion of the dangers which ensue from this want of control, and with a contrast between the popular management of national expenditure in this country and the uncontrolled liberty of bureaucratic officials, and especially the heads of spending departments, in India. It may not, perhaps, be strictly accurate to say that there is no check upon Indian expenditure. The mischief is that the checks which exist on paper are so unreal and illusory as to be worse than useless. They suggest the performance of functions which are really neglected and which, but for them, could not be neglected without notice.

Wanted: Effective Control.

That the existing checks upon Indian expenditure are ineffective and illusory is due partly, of course, to the essentially official character of the Government of India, but partly also to arrangements based upon a false analogy between the systems of financial administration in India and the United Kingdom respectively. The Exchequer Audit Act, for example, is useful enough in England, where the Comptroller and Accountant General is backed up by a representative House of Commons, to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is responsible. The Act provides effective machinery by which the taxpayers can exercise a revisionary control over financial administration. But to transplant the same system to India is by no means to accomplish the same purpose. On the contrary, it probably means in India little more than to invite one part of the official machine to supervise the work of another part of the official machine, and to supervise it with results which have already been obtained as a matter of daily routine. The salt of contact with the taxpayers themselves, or with the House of Commons as representing the Indian taxpayers, is wanting. There can be no greater mistake than to underrate the personal influence of the Viceroy. It makes, in the Aristotelian phrase, not merely some difference but all the difference whether he is disposed to support the desire of the Finance Minister for economy or the desire of the spending departments, and especially the overgrown and over-represented military department, for expenditure. As for the discussion of the Budget, it is at present, as Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji shows anew, little better than a mere farce alike in India and in the House of Commons.

The Moderation of India.

What is wanted is to secure real connecting links between the people who find the money and the authorities who disburse it. Adequately to accomplish this end would obviously involve an effective system of popular representation in India. The moderate demands of educated Indians are, however, content for the present to propose a much simpler modification of the existing machinery. They ask, so far as control in India is concerned, that the Legislative Councils may be enlarged and made more truly representative, and that amendments and divisions may be permitted in discussions upon the Budget. As regards control on this side, they ask that the India Council, until it is abolished, may be reinforced by representative Indians; that the debate in the House of Commons upon the Indian Budget may be transformed from a perfunctory sham into a living reality by the previous, regular and thorough information of the House through a Standing Committee, which shall consider not merely the cut-and-dried statement of the Finance Minister, but also the debates in the Viceroy's Council and the dissents of members either of that Council or of the India Council; and last, but not least, that the salary of the Secretary of State for India may be placed upon the British Estimates, and that he, equally with his colleagues in the Ministry, may "face the music" of effective criticism at the hands of Parliament. In other words, so far as financial machinery is concerned, the problem before the Royal Commission is permanently to ally the knowledge of financial experts in the Government of India with the authority of the House of Commons, and to permeate and vivify both the one and the other by real contact and sympathy with the wishes of the Indian people. We hope that Lord Welby and his colleagues will rise to the occasion.

The Outlook Abroad.

Shortly after the present Government was formed, Mr. Balfour observed that its difficulties would probably arise not in domestic affairs but in international relations. The outlook abroad suggests that Mr. Balfour was

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a true prophet, though it remains to be seen whether the many classes of electors who received lavish promises from Unionist candidates last summer will therefore consent to be put off. The New Year came in amid the gravest anxieties. Already the difficulty between Great Britain and the United States with reference to Venezuela had been added to the Armenian problem, which Lord Salisbury's Government inherited from its predecessor. The beginning of the year brought the news of Dr. Jameson's outrageous attack upon the Transvaal. This remarkable incursion, like President Cleveland's Message, afforded Continental critics of the United Kingdom a congenial opportunity which they utilized to the full. The *Times* of January 18th printed under the title, "England's Enemies" a letter from "A Foreigner," expressing his astonishment "on finding that not only Americans, Turks and Boers, but nearly all the nations of Europe and Asia manifest great animosity towards Great Britain." The intelligent foreigner asked himself the cause of these things, and his answer suggests the question, To which foreign nation does he himself belong? For it is, he thinks, primarily "envy and jealousy" which make England "hated and feared." Germany, France, and Russia are annoyed to see us "bringing forward extraordinary and salutary changes in the social and political conditions in distant, wild, and semi-civilized nations." Germany, in particular, has "fallen into the vice of self-admiration" and cannot bear to be reminded of "the ubiquity of the Union Jack." Also, our Government is credited with having stirred up the Armenian question with ulterior designs. On the whole, it is a not unflattering picture, and the intelligent foreigner was rewarded for his moderation with the largest type on the leading page. At the same time it is just possible that there are other foreigners who dislike England, not because they are jealous of her virtues, but because they seem to perceive in us qualities that we should describe as covetousness and a desire for aggression in Germans or Russians. That little affair of the Viceroy's Proclamation in the Chitral campaign, for example, produced a certain impression upon many minds, especially as Mr. Balfour argued in public that our "prestige" demanded violation of our word.

England, France, and Siam.

The dispute between France and England about the Upper Mekong Valley has at last been settled. Lord Salisbury, who was once described as "a lath painted to look like iron," has come to terms with France, and the terms are such as no Frenchman could have refused. In other words, France has obtained everything. The Mekong will henceforth be the boundary of the French possessions up to the Chinese frontier, Lord Rosebery's theory of the "buffer State" goes by the board, the British garrison at Mongsin is to be at once withdrawn, and Siam becomes subject to a French protectorate. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says that the settlement "does not look promising," while the *Observer* opines that it is "simply amazing." We have yet to learn the opinion of that distinguished traveller, author and statesman, Mr. George Nathaniel Curzon, whom, for the moment, it seems to have paralysed into unusual silence. It is said that Lord Salisbury's concession is but an outward and visible sign of a general understanding with France. If so, the Conservative party, who have hitherto cultivated Germany with diplomatic passion, have modified their theory of European relations. Will the new understanding, if there is one, extend to a discussion of the Egyptian question? Meantime, there are those who ask what the Siamese think of the arrangement, and whether we have disposed of their territory without obtaining their consent. Perhaps Mr. Curzon will throw light upon these matters in the speech in which he announces his resignation. He has declared, in season and out of season, that the future of the British Empire depended upon resistance to French encroachments in Siam. But Mr. Curzon has declared so many things, especially about the British Empire, and perhaps Lord Salisbury agrees with the *Daily News* that "the future of our Indian Empire depends upon the wisdom of her rulers, and not upon the ownership of Luang Prabang."

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

In continuation of our previous articles on this subject, we print below a series of important expressions of opinion by eminent authorities. These statements will be incorporated in the Memorandum which is shortly to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India.

I.—By the Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse.

The Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse, Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council 1872-77, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and of the Quorum of the House of Lords for Judicial Purposes, etc., etc., etc., writes:—

I have received the papers you send for the purpose of effecting further separation between purely executive and administrative functions on the one hand and judicial ones on the other.

I have been for many years detached from Indian affairs, and cannot speak with confidence, or even with accuracy, on points of internal government,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

which must turn on details. I do not even know whether such changes as have been made in the Civil Service since the Criminal Procedure Code of 1872 or the Civil Procedure Code of 1877, or, indeed, whether the working of those Codes, and of the Courts Acts which dovetail with them, have tended in the direction of further separation or the contrary. So far as your general aims and objects go, you have my strong sympathy. I have, however, nothing to say except generalities which I uttered many times in speech and writing since my return from India in 1877. It has always seemed to me that the substitution of a fixed impersonal law for the personal views of the ruler for the time being, and in the particular case, is one of the most important advances in good government that can be made in any country; and, again, that this advantage cannot be secured unless the law is declared by a separate staff of functionaries. How far the separation shall be carried, so as to secure the utmost amount of independence in the judiciary that is consistent with the unity and stability of government, is a question of statesmanship depending on the condition of the country. I believe that under Asiatic rulers the principle of independence was so merged in that of unity as to be very weak, even if perceptible. And I have always claimed for our countrymen that we have either introduced it or made it a living thing. In the course of my work as Law Member of Council, I held many conversations and discussions with Bengal zemindars and with nobles and landholders in other parts of India, and, rightly or wrongly, I came to the belief that they had grasped the principle of judicial independence firmly and put a true value upon it, and looked on it as a great safeguard. And in answer to the common superficial sneer about our beer-bottles, I have said, among other things, that if we were separated from India we should leave an active and working conception of law, which did not exist before our time, and which is one of the most potent contributions to the framework of a nation.

I do not know whether my colleagues took such strong views as I as to the value of an independent judiciary; nor do I think that any event in my time called for its discussion in a crucial shape, such as brings out conflicts of opinion. But it was, I think, generally assumed to be good, except for very backward and primitive parts of India; and the objections to making it more complete were mainly on the score of expense. In fact, as regards civil suits, where the litigants bear the expense in the shape of court fees, the separation is perhaps as fully effected as need be; and I understand that your present demand is not grounded on any mischief felt in civil suits. With regard to criminal proceedings, I think the general view among high officials was—it certainly was mine—that more ought to be done when the means were forthcoming. I gather from your papers that contrary views are now in the ascendant.

These general views are all that I can express. It is a very long way to descend from them to particulars, and to say that the circumstances of the day not only demand, but render possible, a further extension of independent judiciary. I think it likely, and you have my hearty sympathy with your aims. But beyond that, and it is very little, I cannot help you.

II.—BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR RICHARD COUCH.

The Right Hon. Sir Richard Couch, Chief Justice of Bengal, 1870-75, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, etc., etc., writes:

I am obliged to you for sending me the January number of your journal, "INDIA," and the print of the interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose. The latter discloses a state of things which certainly ought not to exist. Judicial and executive authority and functions are incompatible. It is essential to the proper administration of justice that the judicial officers of the Government should not be subject to such a trial of the independence and sense of duty as appears there. The facts stated by Mr. Ghose have mostly occurred during the last twenty years, when I had ceased to hold any judicial office in India, and I cannot from my own knowledge give any opinion upon the action of the executive officers during that time. Mr. Ghose says: "In the olden days the Executive were in the habit of loyally accepting the decisions of judicial tribunals." This, according to my recollection, agrees with my experience in India. "But," he continues, "within the last twenty years there has been a manifest tendency to put pressure upon our judicial tribunals to decide cases according to the wishes of the Executive." As regards this, I am unable to believe, with Sir Richard Garth, that the Government of India approves it and would be sorry to see it altered. I think every practicable effort to preserve the independence of the judicial tribunals in India should be made, and trust that your proposed publication of Mr. Ghose's paper and a subsequent representation to the India Office will have due effect.

III.—BY SIR ROBERT T. REID, Q.C., M.P.

Sir Robert T. Reid, Q.C., M.P., Attorney-General in the late Liberal Administration, etc., etc., writes:—

I do not know in detail the manner in which, or the extent to which, Judicial and Executive duties are discharged in India by the same persons, and therefore I could not without much more information than I at present possess offer any criticism upon your scheme.

But I certainly consider that it is most unadvisable in any country for the same person to act as a judge and as an officer of the executive government. However scrupulous and careful a man may be, it must be very difficult at times to reconcile such different functions, and in case of abuse of power the evil consequences of such a dual authority might be incalculable. The thing is not allowed in England and every man who has read history ought to hope that it will disappear in India.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

IV.—BY SIR WILLIAM MARKBY.

Sir William Markby, late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, Reader in Indian law in the University of Oxford, etc., writes :—

I have read Mr. Manomohan Ghose's memorandum with attention, and it only confirms the view which I have always held, and which is, I should suppose, held by everyone who has had any experience in the administration of justice, that the union in the same person of Judicial and Executive functions always leads to injustice.

In Mr. Ghose's memorandum matters are touched upon which do not quite strictly belong to this subject. But the evil, I take it, upon which he desires to mainly insist, and which he desires to see remedied, is this : that magistrates who are responsible for the peace of a district, whose duty it is to initiate criminal proceedings, and who are, in fact, virtually police officers, also exercise large and preponderating judicial powers in the same district.

That magistrates should have failed to exercise satisfactorily functions so entirely opposed to each other as those of policeman and judge is not at all surprising. It would have been a miracle had it been otherwise. The zeal in procuring a conviction which is the first duty of a policeman is absolutely inconsistent with the impartiality of a judge.

That there are miscarriages of justice arising from this unfortunate union of functions, and that these miscarriages of justice do great harm as tending to shake the confidence of the people in the administration of justice itself, I have no doubt whatever.

I would, therefore, gladly see the magistrates of all grades relieved entirely of all duties other than those which are purely judicial, and also see them made responsible for the performance of their judicial duties to the Sessions Judge and to the High Court, and not in any way to the District Magistrate or to the Commissioner.

Such a change would save many of the evils suggested by the memorandum of Mr. Ghose, and as it only involves a transfer of functions without any increase of work, I cannot see why it should involve any increase of expenditure.

If there is any reason to suppose that the system might be ineffectual for the repression of crime it might be tried as an experiment in one of the districts adjoining Calcutta. It seems hardly likely that a system which succeeds perfectly well in that city, would be a failure if tried in the immediate neighbourhood.

V.—BY SIR RAYMOND WEST.

Sir Raymond West, late Judge of the High Court, Bombay, etc., writes :—

I am keenly alive to the disadvantages that arise from the combination of executive and magisterial functions. We should not get rid of all difficulties or secure absolutely perfect justice by a severance of the duties, but we should remove many temptations to abuse, which may not always be overcome, and many grounds for suspicion and misrepresentation. Ten years ago, or thereabouts, I wrote a letter to Lord Dufferin, in which I insisted on the necessity for a gradual reform, and pointed out how, in my opinion, it could be effected. He sent me a courteous and appreciative answer, but nothing was done. The Government, strongly executive in feeling, are no doubt wholly opposed to a change, which they think would weaken the hands of the general administration. They are conscious themselves of a strong desire for the people's welfare, and not without reason credit the local officers with similar wishes. But seeing certain material conveniences in the present system, and naturally loving what is called strong government, they ignore the underlying moral weakness of the system—its incapacity to command complete respect and confidence.

UITLANDERS AND INDIA:
THE MOTE AND THE BEAM.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

We have before us this week two important and characteristic speeches bearing on the claims and destiny of subject races. At Manchester the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour has lectured the Boer rulers of the Transvaal on their duty towards the 50,000 disfranchised Uitlanders of the Rand; at Bombay the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta pleads with the British rulers of India for political justice towards the 250 millions of his unrepresented fellow countrymen.

In his Manchester speech Mr. Balfour bases his argument on a political axiom, which corresponds with the doctrine in mechanics of stable and unstable equilibrium. Referring to the position of the Uitlanders, he lays down the proposition that a State cannot possess the elements of stability and permanent prosperity if the vast majority of the inhabitants, who pay the greater proportion of the taxes, are allowed no share whatever in the government of the country. Yet curiously enough, it does not seem to occur to him that this pernicious condition of unstable equilibrium is exactly the state of affairs we try to maintain, on so exaggerated a scale, in India. This is what he says : "In the opinion of this Government . . . . it is quite impossible, human nature being what it is, that matters shall ever be satisfactory in the Transvaal so long as the system of government there is founded on so artificial . . . . and so inequitable a basis. It is not possible from what we know of the working of human beings, from what we know of the character of the Uitlanders as they are called—the English, Americans, and Germans, who form the great community of Uitlanders in the Transvaal State—it is not possible, knowing what we do of the traditions in which these men

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

have been brought up and of their character, to suppose that any State in which they form the vast majority—not merely the majority but the vast majority—in which they pay by far the greater proportion of taxes, but in which they are allowed no particle of authority, no particle of share in the government of the country—I say it is impossible that a State so constituted could be a State possessing the elements of stability and permanent prosperity." What could be better than this homily, as a modern instance to illustrate an ancient parable? It is indeed a quaint exhibition of insular self-assurance, this British statesman offering to remove the mote from President Kruger's eye, while seemingly unconscious of the enormous beam in his own.

But let us pass on to the practical part of the parable; and invite the right hon. gentleman to cast out the beam which is in his own eye, by making reasonable political concessions to that vast majority in India, who pay the taxes, but are allowed no particle of authority or share in the government of their own country. Perhaps it may be objected that, in stating the general proposition, Mr. Balfour meant to limit its application to those possessing the traditions and character of the Uitlanders? Quite true. But I would ask, in what respect are the people of India, inhabiting their own native land, less deserving of consideration than the congregation of foreign adventurers who have voluntarily migrated to the Transvaal, in the pursuit of wealth? What is there in the traditions and character of the Uitlanders which entitles them to Mr. Balfour's special sympathy? Is it their impatience; their violent language; their conspiracy against established authority; their secret importation of revolvers, rifles, and Maxim guns? I am glad to think that such a course of conduct forms no part of the traditions or character of the Indian people, and I regret that it should be indicated to them, by so high an authority, as the path leading to political privileges. Under the guidance of their educated brethren, their methods have hitherto been purely constitutional. For more than ten years, meeting annually in their National Congress, the Indian people have, in moderate and respectful language, sought redress for their many grievances; setting forth in definite shape the practical reforms needed for the general welfare. Surely under these circumstances the ruling power ought to do one of two things: it ought either to give a careful hearing to these complaints; or else it should concede to such a patient and law-abiding people some little share in the management of their own affairs, so that they may redress their grievances for themselves. But no; our marvellous policy is to refuse to do either one thing or the other. Doubtless the second alternative is the better one, to give the people some voice in their own affairs; but that has not been adopted; although Mr. Balfour most truly points out that where the great mass of the people are allowed no particle of authority, no particle of share in the government, neither stability nor permanent prosperity are possible. Political concessions are apparently to be reserved for those who possess the traditions and character of the Johannesburg Uitlanders. But if the absence of such traditions and character disentitles the people of India to any share of self-government, and if in their simplicity they cling to constitutional methods, surely that is not a reason for refusing the other alternative, viz., a kindly hearing to their representations? Yet, strange to say, this is the course of action which commends itself to the Indian officials. Year after year these representations are treated with contemptuous neglect; while the Congress leaders, the men who, at great personal sacrifice and with much labour, have rendered the movement truly representative, and have kept it strictly within constitutional lines, are pursued with unceasing insult and ridicule. Verily, the fatuous perversity of such a method of ruling a great empire is enough to make Nicholas Macchiavelli turn in his grave.

The true aims and objects of educated Indians have been well stated by the Hon. Mr. Mehta in the eloquent speech at Bombay, to which I have already referred. The main points of that speech are reproduced on another page, and I would earnestly commend its perusal to those who wish to understand the sentiment which animates the educated class in India. Their desire is to become the interpreters between the British Government and the masses of their fellow countrymen. Firmly persuaded that in the British connection, in the reawakening which follows the culture and science of the west, lie the brightest hopes of their race, they desire so to mould the British administration that it may become a national one, by the force of national approval and national support. As Mr. Mehta says, it is the gift of higher education, freely and generously bestowed in a past generation by men like Mountstuart Elphinstone and Lord Macaulay, that has inspired an unselfish devotion to the welfare of India combined with attachment to British rule: "From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone, issued a band of noble youths thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, in making the foreign rule of the country, in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, a blessing to them both, instead of a curse." Sad it is indeed when British officials, belonging to a later and less heroic generation, feel no desire to foster and perpetuate such sentiments, and can only regard the educated leaders with jealous dislike. A distinguished minister of the late Czar once lamented this purblind condition of the bureaucracy in his own country: "Unfortunate country!"—he wrote to a friend, "Will ever the happy day come when a Russian, like a citizen of any other country, will be allowed openly and freely to express his views, his convictions, his opinions upon men and things without running the risk of being proclaimed a revolutionist and an enemy of law and order?" Similarly we may say of India, "Unfortunate country!—will ever the happy day come when an Indian can tell the Government the plain unvarnished truth without having his

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

integrity questioned and his motives misrepresented?"

Among the younger generation of Indian public men there is no one more competent than Mr. Mehta to speak on behalf of the people of India. As a barrister of wide practice; as the Chairman for many years of the Bombay Municipality; and as an elected Member of the Viceroy's Council, he has experience of every phase of life among his fellow countrymen, whether social, municipal, or political; and in every one of these departments he has been found a fearless and eloquent advocate of progress and reform. This was well expressed by the delegates who on the present occasion met in Bombay to present him with an Address of confidence: "We have met here," they said, "as representatives of the Native public of this Presidency, and we deem it our duty to signify to you and to the public at large, as well as to the Government, our unabated confidence in you as a representative leader and spokesman of this Presidency, and as the chosen advocate of the Indian people in the Councils of the Empire." Surely, in the interests of good Government, we should listen to the warnings of men of this type, and cultivate their friendship. Among foreign nations at present we seem to have no friends; and all the more necessary is it that we should be on cordial terms with these of our own household. Especially is this the case as regards India, which, with its boundless resources, must be to us a tower of strength if we have the people with us, but, if we alienate their affections, must be a source of weakness and danger. No great sacrifice is necessary in order to secure the goodwill of this great, docile, and industrious people. What is asked for is the fulfilment of promises already given; a little attention to practical grievances; a more kindly and sympathetic attitude; or at least a a cessation from needless attacks and insults directed against the persons and aspirations most dear to them. Considering the vast importance of a friendly India, it seems a strange thing that the semi-official Anglo-Indian Press should exhaust its energies in promoting ill-will. Even at this inopportune moment there seems to be special activity in this direction; for Mr. Mehta has to complain of "a remarkable recrudescence of calumny, misrepresentation and resentment against all those natives who venture, however humbly, to take an active interest in the welfare and progress of their country."

Can we not give up this habit of lecturing, scolding, and abusing our neighbours? Such conduct is not admired in an individual. Why should we adopt it as a nation? It is neither dignified nor profitable. By some means or another we have so managed our affairs that we do not possess a single friend among the nations of the world. And this state of things suggests a little self-examination. We may be altogether in the right, a sort of latter-day Aristides, and all the rest of the world wrong. But it would be well to make sure that this is the case. There is a Scotch story of a girl and her lover, which seems to be in point. Jock was in the volunteers, and she went with her mother to admire him at his drill, but when the regiment marched past something evidently was wrong, and she cried out "Oh, mither, mither, look! the hale regiment is oot o' step wi' oor Jock!" Something of this sort appears to have happened to us at present. We seem to be out of step with the rest of the world. Would it not be a good thing to get into step with the 250 millions of our Indian fellow subjects, who are only too anxious to march along side of us, if we will only allow them to do so?

WANTED: REFORM OF THE COUNCILS.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

Among the burning questions which are exercising the minds of those interested in the advancement of India, the expansion and reform of the Legislative and Provincial Councils finds a prominent place, and this, too, though it was only in 1892 that the Indian Councils Amendment Act was passed, by which some valuable concessions were made to the public demand. Those to whom this boon was granted are anything but satisfied. For years past there had been an ever increasing demand that some at least of the members of the Councils should be elected by the people, and it was with this proviso that Mr. Bradlaugh introduced his Bill into the House of Commons. The British Government, finding itself hard pressed, thought it advisable to bring in a Bill having for its object the expansion of the Councils, and obtained precedence for it, thus putting Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill into the background. The Government measure passed into law, and, though it is much to be regretted that it did not in express terms introduce the elective system as regards the non-official members to be appointed to the Council, it must in justice be admitted that the English Legislature approved of the adoption of the principle of election, but left it to the Viceroy to frame rules which would ensure the direct representation of the people in the Councils. When the Bill was being discussed in the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone, referring to the opinions of Lords Northbrook, Ripon, and Dufferin, all ex-Viceroys, made the following remarks:

"These men have entirely exempted themselves from whatever prejudices administration may have entailed on them, and they have distinctly and deliberately sanctioned the introduction of the elective principle. It is there that we stand upon solid ground, and Her Majesty's Government ought to understand that it will be regarded as a grave disappointment if, after all the assurances we have received that an attempt will be made to bring into operation this powerful engine of Government, there should not be some result such as we anticipate. I do not speak of its amount, I speak more of its quality."

Mr. Gladstone went on to say:

"I believe we are justified in looking forward not merely to a nominal but to a real living representation of the people of India."

As if to clear up any remaining doubts, he added:

"My construction of the Under-Secretary's speech (I do not think it will admit of any other construction) is, that it implies that in the opinion of the Government and of the House of Lords a serious effort should be made to consider carefully those elements which in the present condition of India might furnish material for the introduction into the Councils of the elective principle."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The Under Secretary of State accepted the construction put by Mr. Gladstone upon the intentions of the Government in introducing this Bill, and said:—

"I need only say, in conclusion, that I entirely accept the statement of the right hon. gentleman as to the objects with which this Bill is introduced."

That sentiments so clearly expressed should have raised high the hopes of the Indian people was only to be expected. But they were soon disillusionized. Lord Lansdowne may have been actuated by good intentions. Indeed, he quoted with approval, in his speech in the Legislative Council, the following words of Mr. Gladstone's:—

"I am not disposed to ask of the Governor-General or of the Secretary of State that they shall at once produce large and imposing results. What I wish is that their first step shall be of a genuine nature, and that whatever scope they give to the elective principle shall be real."

The outcome of this speech was, however, most disappointing and illusory, the rules were framed in an illiberal and narrow spirit, and the line of conduct subsequently adopted by the Government of India and the subordinate officials has the appearance of being actuated by a desire to render nugatory the privileges granted to the people.

In some quarters there is now a desire to agitate for the repeal of the Indian Councils Amendment Act, 1892, and to press upon Parliament the necessity of passing another Act more liberal and explicit in its provisions. This would be a most impolitic step. It would be a total misapplication of our time and energy. By years of continuous agitation we obtained this amending Act, and it will take years before we obtain another. The object we have in view is more likely to be attained, and at an earlier date, if we direct our attention to the amendment of the rules framed by the Viceroy and ask that they may be administered in a more sympathetic spirit. What are our objections? They may be summarised as follows:—

(i) Though certain important bodies have been allowed to elect their representatives to the Councils, the people at large are by no means sufficiently represented;

(ii) The mode of election is defective with respect to the few seats reserved for the representatives of the people;

(iii) An almost undisguised attempt is made to restrain the freedom of speech of members and to restrict the right of interpellation;

(iv) The introduction of the doctrine of mandate fetters the action of members by making it obligatory on them to vote, not according to their consciences, but according to instructions received from the Secretary of State for India.

(i) The complaint as to the paucity of popular representatives comes from every one of the four Provincial Councils. Each Local Government framed its own rules under the sanction of the Government of India, and it seems as if the officials feared at the outset that, by increasing the number of seats to which members would be elected by the people, they would thereby open the door to men who would be beyond their control and influence. To take one Province—the Bombay Presidency—as an example. The Councils Act of 1892 gave eight seats for which recommendations could be made for nomination by the Government. They were distributed as follows: 1. The Bombay University; 2. The Municipal Corporation of Bombay; 3. Bombay Chamber of Commerce; 4. Karachi Chamber of Commerce; 5. Sirdars of the Deccan; 6. Zemindars of Sind; 7 and 8. General Public. We find here that whilst for the classes numbering, say, about 5,000, six seats are reserved, to the masses numbering 19,000,000, only two seats are allotted. The Bombay Chamber of Commerce and the Karachi Chamber of Commerce are composed entirely of Europeans and would, as a general rule, take the official view of questions coming up before the Council. The Sirdars of the Deccan and the Zemindars of Sind are subservient to the Government and would never dream of offending it. Their representatives would be safe to vote with the officials, who thus by their curious distribution of the seats practically secure a majority of the votes of the members who are supposed to be elected. In two of the provinces the university vote may be counted upon by the Government, for the majority of the electors are Europeans and would, of course, send a European to represent them. To any unprejudiced mind it will be clear that it was never the intention of Parliament that the distribution of the seats should be so manipulated by the Government as to secure for itself most of the votes of the so-called elected members.

(ii) The mode of election of the members supposed to represent the people is intrinsically defective. The Municipalities and District Boards of a Province are divided into two groups respectively, and each group is allowed alternately to elect a member to represent it in the Council. This plan would not be open to objection if these Municipalities and District Boards were representative of the people. But they are not. Both of these bodies are often composed of members nominated by the Government, and sometimes of members who may be divided into three classes:—official, nominated, and elected, with a chairman who is usually an official. It invariably happens that the official and nominated members (who are, of course subservient to the Government) constitute a majority. Hence it naturally follows that only such persons are elected by the Municipalities and District Boards as are in favour with the Government. It has occasionally happened that the District Officers have openly brought pressure to bear, in order to secure the election of their nominees, even going to the length of taking advantage of their position as chairmen to get themselves elected as of the delegates to whom is left the final election of the member who is to represent them. Again, while all the District Boards take part in such elections, this privilege is conferred on only some of the Municipalities. In the North-Western Provinces, for instance, only 20 out of 103 Municipalities have the franchise. That an election on such a basis should rouse discontent is not to be wondered at. When Mr. Bradlaugh introduced his Bill it contained a proviso that the franchise should be conferred on at least 2 per cent. of the total

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

population of the Province, which would have been satisfactory. The Government has now two alternatives before it. If it is really desirous to secure an election by the people which would not be open to objection, it should confer the franchise with due qualifications on the people to elect a representative direct to the Council. Or if it desires, as at present, to leave the election in the hands of the Municipalities and District Boards, it should permit only the elected members on these corporate bodies to record their votes, which would of course necessitate the increase in some Municipalities, and the appointment in others where there are none, of elected members. The officials ought on no account to take part in these proceedings. Apart from the instances which have, of late, frequently occurred of officials trying their utmost to secure the return of their nominee, the mere fact of their being interested in a particular person is liable to influence unduly the minds of the electors.

(iii) Restraint on the freedom of speech and restriction of the right of interpellation. Recent events have borne out the oft-repeated statement that nominated members could not feel or be credited with that amount of independence which it is essential that they should enjoy. It was too much to expect them to criticise the actions of the very men who brought them into existence. With the introduction of a new class of men under the elective system the Government officials should have been prepared to face public criticism, to which no doubt they were not accustomed; and though they might have good reason to smart under such criticism it was hardly expected that they would resent it as they have done. The Hon. Mr. Mehta, in the discussion on the Police Amendment Bill, expressed himself strongly as to the extreme undesirability of investing officials, "under cover of executive measures for the preservation of order, with the power of convicting and punishing without judicial trial;" and he alluded to the prejudices to which all men are liable and from which even the heaven-born civilian is not exempt. For this he was sternly taken to task by Sir J. Westland, who accused him of calumniating "the most distinguished service in the world," and of lowering the reputation of the august assembly he was addressing. In the Provincial Councils the same spirit is shown, but in another direction. Sir Charles Elliott gave the start by raising objections to some of the interpellations of the members of his Council, and innocently suggested that some of the desired information might have been obtained privately from the secretaries, entirely ignoring the fact that publicity was most wanted, and that a hundred answers to questions put "on the quiet" to the secretaries would not possess the same value as one obtained in open Council, which would have the advantage of publicity. Surely we are entitled to ask our rulers to be a little more sympathetic and generous in their action.

(iv) The doctrine of the Mandate. The officials who compose the Viceroy's Council are no doubt members of the most distinguished service in the world, but they seem likely to be more distinguished for some of the extraordinary opinions they hold as to how they are to discharge their duties. Sir M. Brackenbury, in the discussion on the Cotton Duties, said: "There is a difference between those members who have been appointed by His Excellency as additional members and those members of the Council who held their seats by virtue of their being ordinary members," and who, he added, having received definite instructions from the Secretary of State, were bound to carry out those instructions. The Viceroy went further, and swept away this distinction. He said:

> "It is claimed that members must be free to speak and vote in this Council for the measure they honestly think best. I can accept that proposition only with the qualification that they duly recognise the responsibility under which they recieve their rights in this Council. . . . . Every man who sits here sits by the authority of Parliament, and to say that he can refuse to obey the decisions of Parliament would be absurd. . . . . The Secretary of State interprets the will of Parliament, and I protest against our—I will not say obedience to, but rather—acceptance of his decision by anything less than ungrudging assent."

Paraphrased in simple language these words amount to the assertion that both ordinary and additional members of Council are bound to carry out the behests of the Secretary of State. If it is so, then why go through the farce of electing members, and why have any discussion at all in the Council, when all that that august body has to do is to register the decrees of the Secretary of State?

LORD ELGIN AT MADRAS.

[FROM A MADRAS CORRESPONDENT.]

Viceregal tours in India are losing all their importance. Popular enthusiasm ran high when Lord Ripon paid his visit to Madras. For over six miles triumphal arches were erected, and vast crowds ranged on both sides of the road through which the Viceroy passed, bands playing and banners flying. On the place of landing, His Excellency received the municipal address and the people's address. He had set apart a day on which some sixty addresses were presented to him from all parts of the Presidency, to all of which he gave suitable replies. When his successor, the Marquis of Dufferin, paid a visit here there was some popular demonstration. He received the addresses of all public bodies on the place of landing and gave replies. On the occasion of the arrival of the Marquis of Lansdowne there was no enthusiasm whatever. That nobleman also set apart a day to receive all the addresses at the Government House. There was no censorship exercised over any one of those addresses. But now, during the time of His Excellency, Lord Elgin, the Home Rule Viceroy, things have taken a new turn. His Excellency desired that copies of all addresses should be sent so as to reach him on October 16th. Mark the time. He was to arrive in Madras in December. Several public bodies sent copies of their addresses. Some were declined *in toto* on the ground that the Viceroy had no time, and one important political body was asked to omit three paragraphs from its address. The Mahajana Sabha of Madras passed a resolution that under the circumstances no address should be presented. The Viceroy's refusal to receive an unmutilated address from

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Madras Mahajana Sabha created a profound sensation all over the country. The Indian press, both English and vernacular, condemned Lord Elgin's action and congratulated the Sabha on its attitude. The presentation of an address to the Sovereign is a recognised custom, and Lord Elgin has incurred a serious responsibility in denying a privilege which all British subjects enjoy and prize. It is sincerely hoped that the British public will open its eyes to the grave injustice done to Her Majesty's Indian subjects by her accredited representative. The Madras papers—both Indian and Anglo-Indian—with one voice condemned the action of the Viceroy. The *Madras Mail*, the organ of the Anglo-Indians characterised the act as short-sighted, and remarked that Lord Elgin was quite mistaken in requesting that some paragraphs should be expunged. The *Madras Times*, another Anglo-Indian paper observed that,

"so far as the large body of Hindus are concerned, Lord Elgin will be more unpopular among them after his visit than before, wholly owing to his Lordship's want of condescension and tact. This is the first time in Madras in which a Viceroy has behaved in this indiscreet manner."

The *Hindu* described the whole business as meaningless, and said that

"the Viceroy will not receive the address unless certain portions or topics are eliminated; and it is for the public bodies so treated to decide whether, under such circumstances, they should present any address to him at all. His Excellency may impose conditions, but we have the privilege of declining those conditions and withdrawing our addresses. We are sorry we have to write in this manner about the representative of the Queen; but the unexpected attitude of Lord Elgin has rendered a little bit of plain speaking necessary."

The *Madras Standard*, after condemning the Viceroy for his short-sighted and unstatesmanlike conduct, observed that the three paragraphs to which

"objection has been taken contain in fact the very pith of the address, and it is certainly absurd to expect the Sabha to present an address which has no aim or object in view. The Sabha has done well, and deserves well of the country. Madras has again set an example which other Presidencies might copy with advantage."

So much for Madras public opinion. The opinion of all the Indian press was unanimous and vehement. The question is an important one, and the Home Rule Viceroy has in a measure trifled with the feelings of the country. The attitude of the Viceroy is in perfect harmony with the present temper of a considerable section of the bureaucracy, and the British public may be left to judge whether Lord Elgin, being a responsible representative of the sovereign, was justified. It is noteworthy that during his stay in Madras he never spoke to any Indian for more than five minutes. His cold demeanour was the subject of general talk among all classes of Indians.

THE DUTY OF EDUCATED INDIA.

ELOQUENT SPEECH BY MR. P. M. MEHTA.

We refer elsewhere to the eloquent speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, C.I.E., at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on December 20th, in reply to two addresses which were presented to him by the citizens of Bombay and the delegates of the Eighth Bombay Provincial Conference. We reproduce below some of the most important passages in Mr. Mehta's impressive address, which a Bombay correspondent aptly describes as "in reality a kind of manifesto, as well as a vigorous vindication, of educated Indians." Mr. Mehta said that he regarded the addresses as having been presented to him not so much in his personal capacity, but

"as setting forth the motives which actuate the conduct of educated men throughout the country, the principles which guide and regulate their action, the credentials which they possess of their qualifications, and the constituents whom they can, if not scientifically and systematically, at any rate, really and substantially, represent. From this point of view, gentlemen, I receive your addresses with the most grateful acceptance, as setting the seal of public approbation and appreciation on motives which it is now the fashion to malign, on principles which are ignored or misrepresented through prejudice and intolerance, on credentials which are denied, and on the actuality of constituents who are said to have no existence."

"A RECRUDESCENCE OF CALUMNY."

The time chosen for this vindication was, Mr. Mehta said, most appropriate, as there had been recently "a remarkable recrudescence of calumny, misrepresentation and resentment against all those natives who venture, however humbly to take an active interest in the welfare and progress of their country."

"We are bound at all times to speak with respect of the high functionaries of the Crown. We can only deplore that so responsible a Minister as the present Conservative Secretary of State for India, Lord George Hamilton, should have been so far misled as to speak of us in a letter recently written by him as 'those who wish to destroy and revolutionize the organic institutions of their country.' (Oh! oh!) As if this was not enough, we have been only the other day reviled as croakers of evil, shouters of sedition, and revolution-mongers—(loud laughter)—by one of our own countrymen—(loud laughter)—who though never a prophet in his own country, is, by some occult process of metamorphosis, made to look like and pose in England as if he were really a great man in Israel—(renewed laughter)—a man who hob-nobbed with our Rájas, and Máhárájas, was hand and glove with our merchant princes, was foremost among the kings of industrial development, was a philanthropic employer of labour, and who was at the same time the sympathetic friend and patron of the Zemindar and the rayat. (Laughter.) We have never recognized but one Indian who had the right to make a representative claim for all India—and that man by universal acclaim is Dadabhai Naoroji—(loud cheers)—to whom prince and peasant joined to give more than a royal welcome on his way to Lahore, the Christmas before last. The pretensions of Mr. Bhownaggree to depose Mr. Dadabhai in the hearts of his countrymen of all classes and degrees could only be received in India, as they actually were received, with amused shouts and roars of laughter."

THE TWO MR. BHOWNAGGREES.

Mr. Bhownaggree, continued Mr. Mehta, had denounced the educated classes "as sowing discontent and sedition by their perpetual selfish and unscrupulous attacks upon the English in India." This statement was received with "renewed laughter," and Mr. Mehta proceeded:—

"Gentlemen, I for one recognize the singular competence of Mr. Bhownaggree to formulate such an indictment, for I have a very vivid recollection of an incident that took place some years ago. I was returning from Kathiawar and a friend joined me at Wadhwan. We got out for dinner at the refreshment room at Ahmedabad Station. On returning to our compartment, we found an English gentleman installed in it with a huge and fierce-looking dog by his side. Both my friend and myself had very strong objections to travelling in such company for a whole night, and we tried to persuade him to relegate his companion to the dog-box in accordance with

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

railway regulations. On his refusal, I spoke to the station-master, which so irritated the dog's owner that very soon my friend and he came to high words and some not very choice language, and I had just time to rush between them to prevent them from proceeding to blows. (Laughter.) As I took my friend aside and tried to pacify him, the English gentlemen complained to people gathered about how utterly unreasonable and provoking our conduct was in objecting to the company of his dog. 'I never object to travelling even with natives in the same compartment,' he said with the most aggrieved air in the world. You can scarcely conceive, gentlemen, the paroxysm of fury into which my excited friend was thrown at this comparison of the status of dogs and natives, none the less stinging because made with the most perfect unconsciousness of its insolence. I thought it advisable to take him and myself to another compartment where I tried to moderate his somewhat violent tirades against the intolerable rudeness of Europeans towards natives of all classes from princes downwards, by telling him not to generalize overmuch or take individual cases too seriously. But he was not to be consoled; he scouted all attempts to explain away the insolence of the treatment of natives by Europeans as anything akin to the estrangement caused by the exclusive character of native social and religious ways. He called to mind many of the stories on this point related in that excellent article in the October number of the *Contemporary Review* from the pen of the Rev. Mr Bonnar. . . . . Though feeling very sleepy, I was regaled by my friend for half the night with croaking fears as to the permanence of British rule owing to this galling behaviour towards natives, of the same character as are now denounced in the mouth of educated natives. This friend of mine, the hero of this story, was, gentlemen, no other than Mr. Bhownaggree—(loud laughter and cheers)—who has now recanted the errors of his old ways and is posing as a reformed character before Anglo-Indian audiences to denounce the folly and danger of allowing the educated classes to make perpetual attacks on, and criticise Europeans in India, who, if they have faults, have them only as the sun has spots." (Laughter).

HIGHER EDUCATION IN INDIA.

"Our faults," Mr. Mehta added, "are many, our imperfections numerous, our capacities and abilities neither great nor brilliant, our methods disjointed and spasmodic, but our motives are not what they are represented to be by a certain class of Anglo-Indians who have now caught Mr. Bhownaggree to echo their sentiments." Passing on, Mr. Mehta spoke in enthusiastic terms of the spread of higher education:

"From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone issued a band of noble youths thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, in making the foreign rule of the country in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, a blessing to them both instead of a curse. (Cheers.) . . . . There is no word which is so misused and maltreated, and which is more made the vehicle of the fallacy of the middle term than conservatism, when it is used to preach inactivity on our part. (Applause.) Because India is conservative, is there no need on our part to agitate for the reduction, for example, of the salt tax in the interest of the masses, for the enforcement of a policy of economy, for the lightening of the burdens on the land, for securing a more sympathetic and less insolent treatment of natives by Europeans, for securing juster verdicts from European juries in cases of offences against natives? (Cheers.) It is grossly misleading to suppose that what we aim at is to supersede Englishmen altogether, or, as it is sometimes put, to take the administration of the country into our own hands, leaving them the solitary task of supporting us with English bayonets. (Cheers.) On the contrary, no one is more ready than ourselves to acknowledge the singular capacity of the British nation over all other civilised peoples on the surface of the earth for governing a continent like that of India." (Applause.)

ENGLISH "ALOOFNESS."

It was in providing against the perils of a foreign rule of so complex a character that "the watchful criticism and close co-operation of the educated classes could not but be most useful and helpful." The danger, not of an open reversal, but of insidious and indirect evasion of the policy inaugurated in 1858 was always imminent.

"The danger and the mischief lie, in the first place, in the one-sidedness and secrecy of the system, and, secondly, in the circumstance that English officialdom is not in touch with the people. (Loud applause.) I know that the latter statement of fact is vehemently and passionately denied, so passionately indeed that one is tempted to suspect that my lady protests too much. . . . . It has often been a matter of great surprise to me, as I believe it has been to many others, to find in unexpected casual ways how even the most experienced and sympathetic European officers incidentally betray the most startling inability to enter into and comprehend the simplest facts of native life and native thought. The reason lies in what may be termed the 'aloofness' of the English character and temperament. The district officer does his work, but outside and beyond that he stands utterly aloof from the people. His interests and his amusements are jealously confined within the narrow circle of his own people, and he never seeks an opportunity, as he has not the inclination, to enter really into the life of the people around him in the hundred ways in which it can be done even between people of different social and religious creeds."

IGNORANCE OF THE VERNACULARS.

Moreover Anglo-Indians have another serious disqualification. They are not familiar with the Indian vernaculars:—

"Englishmen are not easy linguists at any time; but in India they never acquire anything distantly approaching to a living knowledge of any of the different languages of the people. In the Bombay Presidency there are not half-a-dozen men who have a good colloquial knowledge of any of the vernaculars, or can carry on a decent conversation on general subjects with an ordinary native. They never acquire the lights and shades which are the current coin of the intercommunion of native life, and without a knowledge of which it is impossible to dive into the heart and mind of the people. In pointing out the hollowness of the assertion that District Officers are in touch with the people, I am not enunciating a grievance or exposing a fault; it may be that the aloofness which causes it has its own uses and advantages in other directions; I am simply stating a fact. But it is a fact which is of great importance to recognise. It places these officers in the hands of the people around them who may or may not be worthy of confidence in the way of knowledge, capacity or interest, and deprives their views, opinions and conclusions of the authority due to information at first hand. But unfortunate as this circumstance is in itself, it is fraught with immeasurable possibilities of injustice, oppression, and mischief when taken in connection with the secrecy with which the administration is chiefly carried on." (Cheers.)

CRITICISM AND "PRESTIGE."

"Criticism," Mr. Mehta continued, "is the only antidote of any real efficacy which we possess at present against the inevitable evils of a secret and irresponsible bureaucracy." Those who advocated the repression of criticism urged that complaints lowered the "prestige" of officials.

"Gentlemen, I have come to dread nothing so much as the intrusion of this wonderful word 'prestige' in Indian political discussion. It does duty for every act and measure that has no other argument to support it. Only the other day, so eminent a politician as the present leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Arthur Balfour, vindicated the retention of Chitral on the imperious score of 'prestige,' forgetting that even the carefully edited Chitral Blue-book showed that the occupation was part of a deliberate scheme designed so far back as 1886. (Cries of 'shame.') To me it seems that the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

'prestige' both of the administration and its officers, instead of suffering, is likely to be increased under a freer system, because, in the first place the work would be more carefully done, just as judicial work is done more cautiously and carefully under a system of appeal, and secondly, because there would be a diminution of the possibilities of undeserved obloquy and dissatisfaction arising from ignorance and misunderstanding which a little publicity and explanation would easily remove. (Cheers.)"

EDUCATED INDIANS: TYPICAL CREDENTIALS.

But it is sometimes said that educated Indians are even less in touch with the people than District Officers are. Indians are said to be so denationalized by education as to no longer understand native life and sentiments. To this precious theory Mr. Mehta replied as follows:—

"What are the facts? Why, the large majority of educated natives are drawn from the small towns and villages of the Presidency, and have grown up in contact with all varieties of the trading and agricultural classes. Then is the educated native estranged by his education from his kith and kin, and utterly denationalized? So far from that being the case, we have had recently to deplore a very suggestive spectacle of educated natives sympathizing and going hand in hand in an extreme spirit of reaction and intolerance with the old orthodox opponents of all social reform. It is monstrous to allege that, however educated, the native can throw off the material from which he has grown and developed. A native, educated or not, must in the nature of things intuitively understand native thought and feeling, where the most cultured European must lamentably fail. It is not a question of capacity or attainments, but in the one case it is a question of arduous effort; in the other, it is simple nature. . . . . But what are our credentials of positive knowledge? The other day a friend of mine told me that he was travelling with a high English officer—a Superintendent of Police—and the conversation turning upon the debate on the Police Bill in the Viceroy's Council, the officer was very severe upon my presumption in opposing it, as I could know nothing of things in the Mofussil —(laughter)—whatever may be the extent of my ignorance regarding the city of Bombay. (Loud laughter.) This, gentlemen, is a typical charge in which Anglo-Indian officials are fond of indulging. Though by no means a very favourable specimen, I am willing to submit to an examination on that point—(laughter and cheers)—not of ability, but of knowledge and experience of the people. During a practice of a quarter of a century, I have gone on professional business, times without number. I have traversed in this way Guzarat and Kathiawar, Rajputana and Central India, the Districts to the East and a great portion of the Deccan and Southern Mahratta country. I have thus visited not only the large and small towns, but thanks to the combination of revenue and judicial functions—(laughter)—I have followed the camps of District Officers from village to village in the remotest parts of the Presidency. I have had to appear before all classes of officers from the Mahalakari and Mamlatdar to the District Magistrate and the District Judge. I have practiced in the Courts of Native States and have pleaded before Native Chiefs and their judicial officers of every degree of competence. In the course of these peregrinations, I have come in free, close, and spontaneous communion with all classes of clients, from the Thakore and Talukdar, the tradesman and the artisan, the zemindar and the rayat, not to forget the most famous outlaw of Kathiawar of present days, don't be alarmed, gentlemen, not in the way of being looted—(a laugh)—but in friendly converse and consultation. But it is not the extent of this communion only, that is of importance, it is the nature and character of it. In Guzarat, Kathiawar, and Rajputana at least, I was a native speaking in a common vernacular; in the Mahratta country, I could understand, though I could not freely speak in the language of those parts. I confess my ignorance of Canarese. This alone gave me an immeasurable advantage over the best of Europeans. But what was still greater, the hearts of the people would open to me as they could never open to any, even the most sympathetic, officer, and I could enter into their real thoughts and feelings and interests without let or difficulty. These are my credentials, and they are typical of those of hundreds of educated and intelligent natives. I think we can therefore lay claim to know a trifle more of the heart and mind of our countrymen than the ablest and most experienced of English officers. Some of them have deservedly earned a high reputation for industry and capacity in compiling statistical catalogues and encyclopædias of every variety of Indian information; they perhaps possess a larger collection of the dry bones of Indian history. But of the living forces of Indian life and sentiment, we must humbly take the liberty of claiming a more intuitive, intimate, and superior knowledge. (Applause.)"

THEIR CONSTITUENTS.

Coming to the question, Who are the constituents of educated Indians? Mr. Mehta said that, without being elected, their communion and common nature with the people qualified them to understand and to interpret their wants in a more representative way than their foreign rulers.

"A Kathiawar chief was once put up to say in England that native chiefs had no sympathy with bodies like the Congress and the ways of our educated classes. (Laughter.) Nothing could be more inaccurate. Speaking from my own knowledge, I can vouch that the majority of the chiefs of this Presidency have close sympathy with the aims and objects of educated natives—(applause)—and specially with those of the Congress —(loud applause)—and they have given substantial proofs of their friendly interest. It is true that they do not always give open expression to their views, for fear of displeasing their political officers, who have it in their power to harass them in a hundred different ways, or to withhold from them the guns, orders and honours which they dearly love. But we can know and interpret their opinions and sentiments better than political officers. We know that they are true and loyal, but we know how they resent the treatment that is often given them, for example, in the close and secret manner of deciding upon their claims and rights and differences. . . . . We can equally represent the great masses of the people, and we can enunciate their grievances and the measures for redressing them. We can ask for a reduction of the salt tax in their interest; we can ask for a lighter assessment of the land; we can ask for them economy and reduction of expenditure, and we can point out that nothing is more responsible for squandering the revenues of the country than the military policy which has again come into favour since 1884-1885. We can point out that, while one north-west scientific frontier was bad enough, that policy has added another promising to be equally troublesome, if not in time worse, on the north-east, in the conquest and acquisition of Upper Burma. . . . . It is no doubt a proud prospect for vainglorious 'great Englanders,' but the country regretfully casts wistful glances on the wise policy of Lord Lawrence, whose keen sagacity had recognised that by costly efforts and enterprises to strengthen the outposts and frontiers, you may be indirectly weakening the base by impoverishing the people and undermining their contentment."

"A HIGH AND NOBLE MISSION."

"In these and a hundred different ways we are," said Mr. Mehta in conclusion, "qualified by our position, our circumstances and our education to speak for, to represent and to serve our countrymen of all grades and classes. It is a high and noble mission, imposed by duty and sanctified by patriotism. Let us hope and trust that we may be enabled to rise higher and higher to it, to guide it with unswerving loyalty, to temper it with discretion and moderation, to prosecute it with constancy and integrity, and cement it with harmony and union. Individual persons can participate in it in only a small and humble way, but your presence here shows that if we honestly and fearlessly endeavour to perform what little it may be given to each of us to do, we may be sure of the unstinted and generous support and appreciation of our countrymen of all classes, creeds and persuasions." (Loud and long continued applause.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1896.

THE CONGRESS AT POONA.

THE Eleventh Indian National Congress, which met at Poona during the closing days of December last, was, as our Special Correspondent informs us, and as may be gathered from the universal testimony of the Indian press, a brilliant success. Those who feared, and those others who hoped, that it might prove a scene of faction and division, feared and hoped in vain. It would seem, indeed, that the differences of opinion which were brought to light during the preparations for the Congress have, from one point of view, proved a blessing in disguise. They served to kindle enthusiasm and to arouse curiosity. It is impossible within our limits of space to attempt anything like a full report of the speeches delivered at Poona. We print, however, the text of the resolutions which were adopted, and we endeavour, in the two following articles and elsewhere, to present to our readers in succinct form the salient features alike of the National Congress and of the Social Conference. These are supplemented by the brilliant and suggestive speech delivered by Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta at Bombay, of which we reproduce the greater part, and which Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., discusses on another page. Lord Lansdowne, speaking at a University Extension meeting in London on January 24th, said that the extension of municipal government in India, and the admission of Indians to the legislative councils, far from embarrassing British authority, had been "the means of giving a useful outlet to public "opinion in the country" and had "in many ways "assisted those who are responsible for the conduct "of the affairs of India." The Indian National Congress, which Lord Lansdowne apparently forgot to mention, fulfils the same useful purpose on a vastly greater scale. Its opinions, formulated by the educated community, expressed by representative Indians of ability and experience, and embodied in its resolutions, deserve the careful attention not only of students of that most fascinating of all movements, the course of events, but also of Parliament, the constituencies of the United Kingdom, and the Government of India. The position of Lord Melbourne's Ministry in the House of Lords was compared to the position of a water-logged wreck into which enemies from all quarters poured their broadsides. Lord Salisbury's Ministry is strong in the House of Lords, but it is harassed by a tangled skein of foreign difficulties, and it cannot lightly ignore the essentially sane and moderate requests of the millions of loyal British subjects in India.

One of the first and most important resolutions of the Poona Congress expressed the opinion that the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure will be useless unless it enquires into the lines of policy which regulate expenditure. Before the administration of British India was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown, there was a periodical stock-taking every twenty years at each renewal of the Company's Charter. These periods of investigation coincide with the concession of some of the greatest boons which the people of India have obtained. Since 1858 there has been no such enquiry, and, as we have so often shown, the present Royal Commission is not by any means the kind of Commission which was wanted and asked for. It is, in the emphatic words of Mr. Baikuntha Nath Sen, who proposed the resolution in question, "neither "the semblance nor the shadow of what they "wanted." He referred in terms of the deepest gratitude, and amid the cheers of his vast audience, to the services of the British Committee and the Indian Parliamentary Committee in obtaining the appointment of the Commission. But what the spokesmen of those bodies asked for was enquiry into the condition of the people of India, their capacity or incapacity to bear their present financial burdens, the possibility of reducing expenditure, the nature of the revenue system, and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom. Lord Welby's Commission, thanks to Sir Henry Fowler, is much less ambitious, and it deliberates with closed doors, as if, in the words of one speaker, it were hearing some specially unsavoury divorce suit. Still, that is no reason why it should not be used for all that it is worth, and it will be strange indeed if the strenuous labours of Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine produce no good result. The Congress, as was to be expected, laid special emphasis upon the need of taking evidence in India as well as in London, a suggestion which ought not to escape the notice of Lord Welby and his colleagues. It is hard to see how, in spite of Sir Henry Fowler, the Commission can avoid investigation of policy. The Congress, at any rate

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

has consistently maintained that the chief cause of India's financial embarrassments is not the fall in exchange, but the growth of military expenditure. It sees the only remedy in "a material curtailment "of the expenditure on the Army Services and other "military expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost "of civil administration." Mr. D. E. Wacha, who proposed this resolution, rightly complained that adequate details of expenditure are not furnished by the Government of India. We need not, at this moment, dwell upon a subject with which our readers are so familiar. But we record with great satisfaction the appointment of so indefatigable a worker as Mr. Wacha to be joint honorary Secretary of the Congress in India. Side by side with his resolution we may place another, moved by Mr. H. A. Wadia, of Bombay, declaring that the expenses of expeditions which aim at extending the frontiers of British India should be shared between the United Kingdom and India, and that without some such guarantee the "forward" military policy will involve India in hopeless financial confusion. The point is, of course, that if British taxpayers bore a part of the expense, these expeditions would disappear. In this connexion we may mention Dr. Bahadurji's grave allegations as to the reckless waste of stores in India—a possible cause of expenditure to which Lord Welby's Commission may well pay attention. The result of extravagant expenditure is seen in the odious severity of the salt tax and the neglect of education. One of the resolutions of the Congress thanked Lord George Hamilton for his promise, made last September, to take an early opportunity of reducing the salt tax. The mover, who cited some appalling statistics as to the consumption of salt, expressed a fear that, in view of Lord G. Hamilton's promises to Lancashire, the thanks of the Congress might be premature. The fear was well grounded. Sir James Westland has since proposed to employ fifty lakhs, not in reducing the salt tax, but in readjusting the cotton duties. Can we wonder if Indians reflect bitterly that "on the one side you have the Man- "chester manufacturers, whose voice is powerful, "and who make and unmake Cabinets; while on "the other side you have the Indian peasant, "always quietly bearing the burdens that God and "man may choose to impose upon him"?

But the financial question, grave as it is, is not the whole of the Indian problem. Lord Lansdowne, in the recent speech which we have already quoted, said that if he wished to show what Englishmen were capable of accomplishing, he would point to India. It is probable that he was not thinking at the moment of the threatened interference with trial by jury and the continued combination of executive and judicial functions in the same officers. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance and the value of the speeches delivered upon these subjects by two such competent authorities as Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee and Mr. Manomohan Ghose. Mr. Bonnerjee, speaking with the authority of the leader of the Calcutta Bar, expressed the alarm which is felt at the changes that are continually being made and threatened in respect of trial by jury in India. His speech was a luminous survey of the history of the subject down to the recent Jury Bill which, according to Lord Elgin, proposed a system of special verdicts merely for the sake of obtaining an academic discussion of the question. We should like to know —perhaps we do know—what would be thought of a Government which, in the interests of a debating society, made a similar proposal in this country. Trial by jury is regarded as an institution of vital importance in England. It is still more essential in India where district officers, whose knowledge of the vernaculars is such as to satisfy an examiner, need the co-operation of jurors who do not need to translate the evidence of witnesses. Mr. Bonnerjee was able to state that, so far as Bengal was concerned, not a single complaint against trial by jury had been sent up by any section of the population, and nobody had even alleged that a jury had acquitted a criminal who ought to have been convicted. As for the egregious system of special verdicts, which would enable and encourage a judge to cross-examine jurors, Mr. Bonnerjee cannot find in English history, from first to last, even a solitary instance of special verdicts in a criminal case. Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who in an admirable speech renewed the appeal for the separation of judicial and executive functions, repeated the conclusive evidence which he lately adduced in our columns and at a meeting of the East India Association. We need not re-open here a subject of which eminent authorities treat on another page, except to cite the statement, mentioned by Mr. Ghose, of a high Bengal official. That disinterested critic is reported to have assured the Government of India that it was undesirable to divest the district magistrate of his judicial powers because he was the "connecting "link" between the police and the judiciary of his district. "Connecting link," indeed! *Hoc prætexit nomine culpam.* The whole subject is, we are glad to say, shortly to be brought before Parliament and the Secretary of State for India, and we trust that some practical steps may be taken, without much further delay, to remove what is undoubtedly a crying scandal. We have not left ourselves space to discuss the rest of the resolutions. But they are not new. Indian reform moves slowly, and the demands which independent opinion in India puts forward from year to year have not the elementary merit of novelty. They are, nevertheless, of supreme importance, and to ignore them, in a spirit either of contempt or of indifference, is the part not merely of fools but of madmen.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

MR. SURENDRA NATH BANERJI, in the opening words of the eloquent, luminous and comprehensive address which he delivered as President of the Eleventh Indian National Congress, described that assembly as the non-official Parliament of the Indian nation. It is nothing less. Whatever may be the differences of race and creed in India, all races and all creeds meet at the Congress upon a common platform, to protect and extend their rights and to redress their grievances. The preparations for the Poona Congress brought to light, indeed, certain differences

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

within the Congress camp upon the subject of Social Reform. Mr. Banerji, who referred to these incidents in statesmanlike terms, pointed out that those Indians who are, and those who are not, cordial supporters of the Social Conference are nevertheless animated by a common sentiment of devotion to the National Congress. The Congress has not, as yet, a written constitution. Its proceedings and its composition are determined not by law but by custom. Proposals have, however, been made again and again during the past ten years to give to this organisation, which is fighting a constitutional battle, something like a constitutional basis. Mr. Banerji warmly advocated the adoption of well defined rules, which should embody existing practice and obviate future difficulties. The Congress has now passed beyond the stage of infancy. It has survived persecution and abuse, and what it has now to avoid is rather the internal danger of dissension and dispute. Nobody who surveys the triumphant career of the Congress will for a moment believe that that danger is serious. Lord Macaulay, in a prophetic moment, looked forward to a time when British Indian subjects, being instructed in European knowledge, might crave for European institutions. If such a day came, it would be, he said, the proudest in the annals of England. The day has come, and the Congress is the representative exponent of the wishes and hopes of the Indian people. Mr. Banerji, who dwelt with enthusiasm upon the brilliant record of the Congress, claimed for it that it had not taken up a single question without bringing it into the field of practical politics. But it is not merely that in such questions as the enlargement of the Councils, the separation of judicial and executive functions, the reform of the Police and the more generous admission of Indians to the higher offices of State, the Congress has put forward with vigorous moderation the demands of the educated community. It has produced a new spirit, developed a new enthusiasm, and in no mean degree united together the scattered elements of a vast and diversified population.

The Indian Councils Act of 1892 was due to the continued agitation of the Congress, but it fell far short of the hopes of the Congress. Mr. Banerji says that the people of India regard it not as a final settlement but only as a cautious experiment. Mr. Gladstone, discussing the provisions of the measure, said that he hoped it might lead to a living representation of the Indian people. Lord Salisbury said much the same. Would either of them maintain that in Bengal, for example, seven elected members can represent adequately the living strength of a community of seventy millions? The stock argument against the enlargement of the Councils is that the Government must have a standing majority, and therefore if the number of elected members is increased, the number of nominated members must be increased also. The answer is that this increase in the number of official members is not necessary to secure a majority. Mr. Banerji cited the case of the Calcutta Municipality where, although the elected members constitute two-thirds of the whole body, the chairman never failed to carry any resolution which he strongly desired to carry. If the number of elected members of the Councils were increased, the Government would share in the benefit. Even Sir Charles Elliott has expressed the opinion that the extension of the Bengal Legislative Council materially added to its strength, its popularity, and its usefulness. The right of interpellation, in spite of a reluctance in some quarters to give satisfactory answers, has proved specially valuable not only in obtaining information for the public but also in removing misapprehensions as to the policy of the Government. The practice might well be so extended as to include supplementary questions, such as we find in the House of Commons, and brief explanatory speeches, such as we find in the House of Lords. Under the Act of 1892 discussion of the Indian Budget was allowed. But no resolution may be moved, or division taken, upon any item. Mr. Banerji maintains, and maintains rightly, that if there is one class of questions more than another in which popular representatives should exercise control, it is in financial questions. The authority and usefulness of the Councils are further threatened by the new doctrine of "mandate" which declares that members must vote, not according to their opinions, but according to rule. It is one thing for members of Parliament to follow the mandates of constituents with whom they agree. It is another thing for members of a legislative council to obey the dictates of a Secretary of State from whom they differ. Burke, who was a Conservative, though he called himself a Whig, refused in vehement terms to accept instructions even from constituents. Lord Elgin, who is a Whig, though he calls himself a Liberal, is willing to accept and to defend mandates from the India Office. Mr. Banerji discussed at considerable length the financial condition of India. If it be true, as John Bright held, that the financial condition of a country is a sure sign of the character of its Government, the Government of India must be incompetent indeed. Ever recurring deficit, ever increasing debt, are the terms in which Mr. Banerji sums up Indian finance, and, with Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir David Barbour, the Bombay Presidency Asssociation, and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, he finds the chief cause of financial embarrassment in the policy of military aggression. The recent expedition to Chitral was condemned with remarkable unanimity by Indian public opinion. "Prestige" compelled Lord Salisbury's Government to occupy the country in spite of the Viceroy's proclamation. Mr. Balfour says that the retention of Chitral will involve no addition to the Indian army. But Lord Salisbury recently warned us that politicians are apt to under-estimate the cost of projects which they desire to fulfil. If the Indian army is able, without any additional strength or expenditure, to retain Chitral, it is obvious that its previous strength and expenditure were in excess of what was wanted.

We trust that members of Parliament will read with attention Mr. Banerji's vigorous condemnation of the costly, futile and dangerous "forward" policy. The true scientific frontier against Russian invasion lies, he said, not in a remote and inaccessible mountain, nor in the House of Commons, but in the grateful hearts of a loyal and contented people.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The "forward" policy, as Lord Lawrence foresaw, squanders the resources of India to no purpose, while urgent domestic reforms are postponed through lack of funds. It is to be hoped that the whole question, together with the question of the Home Charges, will be thoroughly sifted by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. When Sir C. Dilke was invited on a certain occasion to state his views on an Indian question, he replied that he had stated them twenty years before, and the question stood where it did. It is not easy to lend novelty to the subjects which the Indian National Congress places in the forefront of its programme, but Mr. Banerji treated each in turn with force and spirit. As for the Indian cotton duties, he said plainly that if Manchester has a grievance, she should agitate for financial justice to India, and she would command the sympathies of educated India. Financial justice is not to be found in the Home Charges, in Exchange Compensation Allowance, or in artificial restrictions on Indian industries. Mr. Banerji expects—and we trust that he may not be disappointed—great results from the labours of Lord Welby's Commission, although, in common with all disinterested observers, he regrets that it carries on its deliberations with closed doors. Every Association in India ought, he said, to send representations to the Commission bearing on the question of Indian expenditure and the adjustment of charges between India and the United Kingdom. He repeated with admirable cogency the case for simultaneous examinations, accentuated as it was by the glaring disparity between the best and the worst of the successful candidates at the last examination. The concession of the right so patiently and so eloquently advocated by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is as necessary to the efficiency of the public service as it is to the continued loyalty of British Indians. The exclusion of Indians from the commissioned ranks in the army is a piece of gratuitous injustice which contrasts unpleasantly with the policy of Akbar. In dealing with the deplorable combination of judicial and executive functions in the same officers, Mr. Banerji made a practical suggestion which we heartily endorse. He proposed that an official document should be published annually in each province by some recognised Association, recording the cases which illustrated the evils of the present system and the need of separation. Mr. Banerji's remarks on the Jury Bill and the neglect of education in India deserve careful attention, and it is interesting to find the President of the Congress declaring that Indian questions cannot engage much attention in England until they become party questions. Taken as a whole the speech is a remarkable and compendious statement of contemporary opinion among educated Indians. It should be carefully read by Englishmen who wish to obtain an insight into Indian questions from the non-official standpoint. At the close of a brilliant and exhaustive address Mr. Banerji reminded his hearers that the moral sympathies of civilised humanity were with them, and exhorted them to possess their souls in patience, supported by the undying faith that their cause, based upon the highest justice, must ultimately triumph.

THE SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

The rift in the lute at Poona has, of course, been exaggerated for the purposes of malevolent hostility either to the Social Conference or to the Congress or else to both. This was quite an inevitable result of the divisive forces at work. It is true that the Conference, which has just held its ninth meeting, assembled for the first time in a separate *mandap* from the Congress; and on the face of this fact there is testimony to an unhappy perversity or one-sidedness of view on the one part or on the other or on both. It seems incredibly thoughtless to suppose that movements of the magnitude and complexity of the Conference and the Congress, movements that touch so many and so sensitive roots of social sentiment over so vast an area, can possibly go forward without frequent and considerable friction. The reasonable anticipation is directly the contrary. Men will think differently, for fifty reasons beyond human control. Men will act at different rates of promptitude, and go off at unexpected tangents. Men will persist in believing that just their own particular view is right, and that every other possible view is wrong. The full flower of reason does not bloom in the actions of a nation or a party all in a flash. Let us be reasonable in our expectations of Indian reforms. And let us look at the facts dispassionately.

What is the extent of the rift? It is not true to say that the Congress refused to allow the Conference the accustomed use of its *pandal*. At an early stage in the preparations for the Congress a section of the Poona Committee took up a position, though at that time without the support of any of the other Congress Committees, in view of which the leaders of the Social Conference decided not to ask for the customary favour of the loan of the pavilion. These facts, exaggerated as they have been by men who care neither for the Congress nor for the Conference except in so far as the one may be employed to injure the other, do not justify the conclusion that the Congress had bidden the Conference go its way in separation. Of course, the two movements are perfectly distinct in their organisation and in their immediate and particular objects; and the fact that the Congress originally included in its programme one section of the subjects that are now cared for by the Conference shows nothing more than that the division was practically expedient for the better progress of the general cause. The holding of the annual meetings of the two bodies in the same town and in the same building was simply a matter of general convenience, most of the visitors sympathising with both lines of reform work. The ill-judged energy of the particularists has made the rift more distinct for the moment by leading the Conference to refrain from asking the use of the Congress *pandal* as on former occasions. Now how far does this concession to them represent the views of the adherents of the Congress? A circular letter was addressed to each of the standing committees of the Congress, asking their opinion as to the loan of the Congress *pandal* to the Conference, and the following is a summary of their replies:

"There are 28 replies favourable to the Conference *plus* 4

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

which are indifferent or advise reference to the Congress; in all 32. There are besides 17 unfavourable, but of that number 10 are in full sympathy with Conference work, but advise concession this year to the Poona opposition, and there are only 7 replies which seem to be opposed. The proportion of favourable to unfavourable is thus nearly 2 to 1; and, including those who advise concession for this year only, the proportion is as 6 to 1. In the order of provinces, the Bombay replies are 13; of these 9 are favourable, 2 sympathetic, and 2 opposed. Taking the last two together, the proportion is more than 2 to 1. The Madras replies are 9, out of which 8 are favourable and 1 indifferent. Thus it may be seen that the whole of Madras with one single exception is favourable—and that too is indifferent, and leaves the whole thing to the Poona Committee. In the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, out of 7 replies received, 6 are favourable, and only 1 is opposed. The proportion of favourable to opposed is, therefore, 6 to 1. In the Punjab, the favourable opinions, which are 3, outweigh 2 unfavourable opinions, even taking into account the 1 which is indifferent. Even in conservative Bengal, there are 2 committees who distinctly favour the Social Conference, and there are as many as 7 who sympathize with the Conference but advise concession this year. Only 3 committees there are opposed to the Social Conference, and only 1 is indifferent."

These figures show that the temporary concession to fanatical narrowness, in the interests of internal peace, has been made, whether wisely or unwisely, to a small minority. Further, although the elements of the minority are sporadic, the main part of the excitement on the subject has radiated from Poona as far as Bombay and Satara. The discontentment, though large enough to make an unseemly appearance, will not essentially affect the energies of the Conference.

What is the true explanation of the division? Mr. Justice Ranade rejects as insufficient the very general explanation "that this excitement is due to personal differences and party quarrels." This explanation seems too obvious. "It is a characteristic of our people," says Mr. Justice Ranade, "that where a dozen people work together, one half will call the other half mad or wicked. It is our general habit to misunderstand one another. People think there is no good man among their opponents. But party differences and personal misunderstandings have never made a whole nation mad. It will not be fair to the intelligence of other places in the country of which this city boasts to be the capital to accept this explanation." Such misunderstanding and uncharitableness are, unhappily, but too common in all latitudes. Mr. Justice Ranade thinks he has found a deeper and more real cause for the peculiar fervour of Poona in this matter. He looks up and down the social history of India, and remarks that various methods of working out problems of social reform are adopted in the different parts of the country by different races. There is the method of rebellion; the method of utilising caste organisations; the method of appeal to religious feelings; the method of pledge, or sense of honour; the method of recourse to legislative aid. Now, says Mr. Justice Ranade,

"The peculiar feature of the movement in this Presidency is that we want not to work on single line, but to work on all lines together, and above all not to break with the past and cease all connection with our society. We do not proceed on the religious basis exclusively, as in Bengal. We have the different Samajas, but somehow or other there is something in our nature which prevents us from bodily moving into another camp. We do not desire to give up our hold on the old established institutions. Some might say this is our weakness, others think it connects our strength. Reform work has not been carried out in this Presidency on any one definite line, but we are trying all the methods which I have placed before you. If we were to follow any one method, our quarrels would cease. If we were distinctly prepared to stand in a camp of our own, leaving the whole community to do what they like, we might be at peace, for this is exactly what our friends the reactionist and the orthodox community are desiring us to do. . . . . We are not disposed to follow any one method, and we apply a number of methods to a number of problems, and we do desire, above all, not to occupy a separate camp for ourselves. This is, in my opinion, the chief reason why there has been so much misunderstanding and such exhibition of temper; and when you add to that personal and private differences, you will understand why the unfortunate opposition which was not offered elsewhere was exhibited in this beloved city of ours."

There can be no question but there is very solid matter in this explanation of Mr. Justice Ranade's. The difficulty, however explained, remains; and how far it may be carried, and how deeply it may be accentuated, depends on how far the dissentient minority are amenable to calm reflection and a commonsense view of concerted action on various grounds for a great common object.

The presidential address of Dr. Bhandarkar handled earnestly and impressively some of the more outstanding questions of social reform. Speaking of the proposals of the Conference as to the condition of women, he pointed out, but too truly, that "one half of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources of our country is being wasted." So far as the education of women is concerned, some not inconsiderable first steps have been taken. Thus, the first resolution expressed satisfaction with "the efforts that have been made by various private societies and Samajas in Calcutta, Bombay, Poona, Ahmedabad, Jallandar, and other cities, and by the Native States of Baroda and Mysore, for the promotion of higher female education" in various ways, while urging that further organised efforts should be made in the same direction. Time and tide run strong on the side of the reformers, though discretion and patience must remain steadily vigilant at the helm. The distressful illustrations of married woman's life, which were cited as common examples, ought to touch the heart and conscience of every man whose feelings have not become petrified by custom. The "ill-assorted match" of the old man and the young girl Dr. Bhandarkar condemned even more energetically than the "human sacrifice" resulting from grievous inequality of physical strength. In either class of cases, there can be no doubt but the reformers must expect strong opposition and hindrance, latent or disguised rather than openly declared. Allied with these cases is the practice of early marriage, which Dr. Bhandarkar attacked on historical and social, as well as on physical, grounds. As regards caste, a distinct reversion to the older freedom is in strong progress, fostered immensely by English example and by the social modes of intercommunication, especially the democratising railway. The preposterous way in which society has been broken up by over-driving the principle of caste is shown by the fact that one of the resolutions advocated inter-communication as regards eating and marriage-alliance between members of the subdivisions of the same caste. So much at least is necessary before the larger fragments can be gathered together into the semblance of a whole. Dr Bhandarkar carefully pointed out that the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

reforms advocated by the Conference involve no break of continuity, while they are necessary to the free expansion of the energies and capacities of the people. The solid basis of his position is indicated in the following sentences:

"You will see that what is necessary in order that these reforms may come into practice is that there should spring up in our hearts a sense of justice, a keen sympathy for the sufferings of others, and a love for one's own country and race, and an anxiety for their future well-being . . . . If we ask England to remove our disabilities, we must as a necessary preliminary show that we are worthy of the favour by removing the disabilities of the oppressed classes of our society. Thus and thus alone will our country prosper. Every scheme for bettering our condition is destined to fail if it does not make provision for the growth of these sympathetic virtues, and through them for the realisation of social reform. Let us then invigorate and elevate our souls by ever placing before our mind's eye the precept of the great Indian reformer of the sixth century before Christ, the lion of the Sakya race, Gotam, the enlightened: 'Cultivate a mind boundless in sympathy for all beings as is that of the mother who protects her only son by sacrificing her own life;' and with him proclaim from this Social Conference hall, 'May all living beings, feeble or strong, lowly or great, middle-sized or short, small or large, seen or unseen, living far or near, born or to be born, be happy!'"

It is not necessary to follow the programme of discussion, but it is especially satisfactory to note the resolution in favour of the education and social amelioration of the pariahs. Altogether, though the attendance might well have been larger, the discussion shows that the Conference has planted germs of far-reaching social reform—germs that will steadily expand into beneficent growths throughout the peninsula. And the Conference and the Congress, while working separately, cannot but mingle their results, in mutual support and advancement. It is only by a more or less simultaneous advance along all lines—intellectual, moral, and political—that any real and lasting progress can be made.

A CHALLENGE FROM MADRAS.

WE have read with much interest the publications of the Literary Society of the Presidency College, Madras, for the past year. There is the Annual Report, together with two series of Lectures, and a series of Anniversary Addresses. From these papers it abundantly appears that the year 1895 has been characterised by remarkable activity on the part of the Society—an activity that forms a striking example to other places of learning and study. It is a charming feature of these lectures and addresses that the professors of other colleges, more especially those of the Christian and medical colleges, have generously co-operated with the Professors of the Presidency College. The subjects are of the most varied character; they are handled with the mastery of experts; and they are sufficiently instructive and interesting to justify their circulation far and wide among the public in pamphlet form. They take the student and the general reader outside the limits of their text-books and their ordinary range of daily interest, enlarging their mental horizon, and communicating a large and fresh impulse towards high matters of literary, scientific, social, and practical importance. We remark, with amazement, that in 1894, for the first time in the history of the Society, a social gathering was held; and, without the least surprise, that the function was repeated last year on a larger scale with markedly increased success. Undoubtedly, "considering the humdrum mono-"tonous life an Indian student leads, unrelieved by "any recreations of a social nature, an opportunity "such as this afforded him of spending a pleasant "evening in healthy, innocent enjoyment, cannot "but be most welcome; and it is to be hoped that "such gatherings will in future become an important "feature of not only the Presidency College Literary "Society, but also of similar students' societies." Such meetings give salt to life.

It is well worth while to turn the leaves of these Lectures and Addresses, and see the variety and treatment. The First Series contains half a dozen lectures; and it seems a pity that Mr. Edgar Thurston's lecture on methods of anthropometry as applied to ethnological research, which was delivered without writing, should not have found a place with the rest. Professor Henderson, of the Christian College, surveys "A Neglected Field in Natural "History"—comparatively neglected, that is, in India—the study of the life habits of animals. There is more difficulty, indeed, in prosecuting such study in a tropical country than in a temperate region, not only from the more disadvantageous position of the observer, but from the greater tendency of the animals to shun observation. The neglect is all the more strange in India, however, where venomous snakes, for example, kill their twenty thousand human victims every year. Professor Allen, of the Presidency College, gives a bird's-eye view of the origin and development of the English Parliament; and Professor Kellett, of the Christian College, surveys Europe in the Thirteenth Century—"the Century of Organisation, of Order, "and of Faith." Both these historical lectures, simple, clear, and vigorous, are worth reading here, as well as in Madras and India generally. With these we may place Professor Stone's lecture on the late Sir John R. Seeley, which happily deals, from personal experience, "rather with his unpublished "teaching than with his books." "His great "qualities," says Professor Stone, "were his love "of truth, his desire to advance knowledge—not "for its own sake (I believe he would have scorned "the idea as absurd) but because of its usefulness—"his strong sense of duty." Mr. Glyn-Barlow, sub-editor of the *Madras Times*, discourses very suggestively on "Nationalism and Literature," and enforces an important and true principle. "With this noble "end in view, of winning glory for your people and "yourselves, you will surely do well," he says, "to set before yourselves the remembrance that "nationalism is a power in literature, and you will "do well to make use, as materials for your work, "of the things that your eyes have seen and the "things that your ears have heard, and to mould "them after the likeness of your hearts." Surgeon-Captain Elliot's sketch of the "Theory of Evolution" concludes with a carefully orthodox reconciliation with religion.

In the second series we find five lectures. Professor Satthianadhan, of the Presidency College, sets forth a comparison and a contrast of "Greek and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Indian Systems of Philosophy"—a very comprehensive and able discourse. The Rev. E. M. Macphail, also of the Presidency College, expounds the doctrine of bimetallism, with all the main arguments *pro* and *con*, but judiciously abstains from expressing any opinion for or against the doctrine. The other lectures are scientific. They deal with the Growth of Plants, the Value of Medicine to the State, and the problem of Heredity.

The final pamphlet contains the addresses delivered before the Presidency College Literary Society at its last five anniversary meetings. They are all marked by distinct ability and by reference to the conditions of Indian life. Professor Satthianadhan leads off with a discourse upon "Intellectual Results in India." He lays just stress upon "the intellectual, moral, and spiritual unity achieved by thought" as a cause of the development of national life. He speaks under the personal influence of Seeley, and with an elevated enthusiasm and marked fairness of tone. "In accounting for the comparative barren-"ness of the Indian intellectual field," he urges that "we should never lose sight of the barrier of "language," and of the strain of poverty; and he adduces examples to blunt the edge of Sir Lepel Griffin's sweeping assertion that he did "not "remember, in the last quarter of a century, a "single original work written by a native of India "on any subject of general, literary, political, or "scientific interest, which could fairly take rank "with productions of the second or even the third "class in England." Professor Denham, of the Máhárája's College, Mysore, speaks of "India in search of an Ideal University." Universities India has already, but *bona fide* universities are lacking to round and complete her system of education. Professor Denham reviews the university systems in Western countries, but very properly remarks that "every country will solve the great problem the "sooner and more completely only when it makes "due allowance for its history, its associations, "and peculiarities of national temperament." He wants a visible university, with equipments unattainable by individual cottages.

"This proposal for the establishment of the nucleus of a teaching university, while going a long way to remove the reproach of even less than respectable mediocrity which attaches to intellectual results in India, is one which need not interfere with the independence of the affiliated colleges. It would, however, supply wants which those colleges cannot supply, viz., a common centre of learning with all the advantages, intellectual, social, and moral, attaching thereto, including such specialised teaching as single colleges cannot command. Just as Benares and Trivadi, near Tanjore, are famous for the special study of Sanskrit, and answer the purpose of universities far more than do our so-called universities, so these common centres of learning would, in time, evolve special lines of study in those branches for which India offers peculiar facilities. In the long list of the world's universities, the Indian universities might then take, what they cannot now take by reason of their negative existence, a really creditable place."

The remaining three lectures came from the Board of Revenue. The Secretary offered a careful and able exposition of "Rome's Government of her "Provinces." The Hon. Mr. A. T. Arundel, member of the Legislative Council of the Board of Revenue, furnished a comparison and contrast of "Britain "under Rome and India under Britain." And the Hon. Mr. Sturrock, also member of the Legislative Council and of the Board of Revenue, discussed, in a strong reforming address, "The Attitude of edu-"cated Hindus towards the education of Hindu "women." No doubt, as Lord Wenlock said from the chair, "we shall have to wait very many years "before the movement is taken up as rapidly and "with as much enthusiasm as Mr. Sturrock advo-"cates." But there are signs that the movement is begun and gathering strength.

It will thus be seen that these papers cover a wide range of subjects, of practical as well as of theoretical importance. The guarantees promised by the names and positions of the speakers are found to be amply honoured in the actual achievement. The Presidency College Literary Society thus throws down a high challenge to all similar institutions, and we trust they will all have the spirit to hasten to pick up the gage.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Mackenzie Dalzell Chalmers as Legal Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in succession to Sir Alexander Miller, whose tenure of the appointment expires in April next. Mr. Chalmers has held the Birmingham County Court Judgeship since 1884. In 1894 he acted as Chief Justice at Gibraltar, and in 1895 he was appointed a Commissioner of Assize. Before accepting the County Court Judgeship, Mr. Chalmers had been Counsel to the Board of Trade, and in that capacity, and also in connexion with other Government Departments, had great experience of drafting, notably in the case of the Bankruptcy Act. Mr. Chalmers is the author of a Digest of the Law of Bills of Exchange and of a text book on the "Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881."

The "Diarist" in the *Speaker* wrote on January 18th: The appointment of Judge Chalmers as legal member of the Governor-General's Council is an excellent one, and will do something to neutralise the effect of certain other appointments that have been made recently. Mr. Chalmers is a man of exceptional ability, who has long been marked out for promotion. Indeed it was considered likely that he would be the first County Court Judge to be promoted to the Bench in the event of the barrier which at present separates the inferior from the superior courts being broken down.

Mr. Budruddin Tyabji has sent to the honorary secretary the following acknowledgment of the address from the London Indian Society, congratulating him upon his appointment as a judge of the High Court of Bombay: "I beg to thank you most sincerely for your having kindly forwarded to me the address of the London Indian Society on the occasion of my recent confirmation to the Bench of the High Court. I beg to thank the members of the Society for the extremely kind, and I must say flattering language, in which they have been pleased to express their goodwill towards me and their appreciation of whatever small merits I may possess.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Please convey my sense of gratitude to all the members of the Society, and tell them how highly I appreciate the kindness of my fellow-countrymen in England. It is to the young and energetic men now in England that India must look for her future progress in her moral, mental, and political career, and I can only say that I wish you and all others who now may be in England, all health and prosperity and the complete attainment of the noble objects which they have in view and for the sake of which they have torn themselves from their friends, relations, and country."

It was announced in the *London Gazette* for January 21st that the Queen has nominated and appointed Colonel George Fletcher Ottley Boughey, late Royal Engineers, and Major Harold Arthur Deane, Indian Staff Corps, to be Companions of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India. The Queen has also appointed Mr. Francis Erskine Dempster, of the Indian Telegraph Department, to be a Companion of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire.

It was also stated in the same issue of the *London Gazette* that the Queen has increased by two guns the salute enjoyed as a personal distinction by his Highness Sir Mahdo Singh Bahadur, Máhárája of Jaipur, G.C.S.I.

Mr. H. N. Haridas, a member of the British Committee, and the energetic secretary of the Surat Congress Committee, has during the past month given practical proof of the work which may be done by Indians in British constituencies. He has addressed a series of meetings at Belper, Derbyshire, upon simultaneous examinations, the development of the representative principle in India, the policy of trans-frontier aggression, and the separation of judicial and executive functions. Mr. Haridas has won the hearty sympathy of the Belper electors, and he proposes shortly to continue the work which he has so admirably begun.

We understand that on February 17th a paper will be read at the East India Association by Mr. Alfred Nundy on "The National Congress, its origin, aims, and objects."

The programme for the new Session of the Indian Section of the Society of Arts includes papers by Sir James Lyall, G.C.I.E., on "Punjab Irrigation"; Mr. J. H. Glass, C.I.E., Chief Engineer Public Works Department, Bengal, on "The Great Landslip at Gohna in Gurhwal, and the Measures Adopted to Prevent Serious Loss of Life"; Mr. Walter R. Lawrence, I.C.S., C.I.E., on "Kashmir: its People and its Products"; Mr. C. Tripp (formerly of Sumatra) on "The Tobacco Industry of India and the Far East"; Mr. G. W. Christison, on "Tea Planting in Darjiling"; and Captain Charles Rollestón on "The Deserted City of Hampi." Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who was Lieut.-Governor of the North West Provinces when the Gohna disaster occurred, is expected to preside at the reading of Mr. Glass's paper.

In the *Times* of January 27th the writer of "Indian Affairs" returned to the questions raised by British Indian subjects in Natal, and, with the aid of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's statistics, easily disposed of the absurd contention that the vote of the European colonists might be swamped by an ever increasing number of immigrants from British India. It seems that in Natal there are 9,309 registered voters who are Europeans while only 251 are British Indians. In other words, the European vote—thanks to a high property qualification—is thirty-seven times stronger than the Indian vote. With reference to British Indians in the Transvaal we may point out that their position is far worse than that of the European Uitlanders, on whose behalf Dr. Jameson made his raid. The Europeans are at least exempted from compulsory military service, but British Indians—not being "white persons"—are not.

There are some wiseacres who are never tired of deprecating what they describe as the introduction of Western institutions into India. If they refer to representative institutions, they merely make themselves ridiculous. As the *Times* said on January 27th, "the plea that the British Indian is unacquainted with the nature and responsibilities of representative government" will not "bear inspection." The *Times* continued: "There is probably no other country in the world in which representative institutions have penetrated so deeply into the life of the people. Every caste, every trade, every village in India had for ages its Council of Five, which practically legislated for and conducted the administration of the little community which it represented. Until the introduction of the Parish Councils Act last year there was no such rural system of self-administration even in England."

We quote, without superfluous comment, the following passage from the Jubilee number of the *Daily News*, published on January 21st:—The *Daily News* has always advocated the cause of impartial dealing with the natives of India. It has always upheld the principle that India must be governed not as a place in which Englishmen are to make money but first and foremost for the benefit of the native populations. The *Daily News* has always maintained that by such a principle alone could our dominion in India be made secure. We need not go quite so far as to insist that India ought to be governed according to Indian ideas alone, but we have always held that India must not be governed, and indeed cannot be governed, without the fullest regard for Indian ideas. That, as we have already shown, was the principle strenuously and continuously advocated in these columns by Harriet Martineau. Such opinions were not fashionable or popular then; they have made immense progress between that time and this.

How comes it that early official information, especially about Indian affairs, is so apt to find its way into the columns of the *Times*? Last year some questions were asked in the House of Commons upon the premature communication to the *Times* of the conclusions of the Opium Commission, with the result that the Secretary to the Commission received a severe rebuke. On December 26th last the *Times* printed an evidently inspired article upon the Pamir Boundary Commission, including a sketch map which showed the boundary. Similarly, a fortnight ago the *Times* accurately foreshadowed in a leading

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

article the measures which Sir James Westland afterwards introduced for the readjustment of the cotton duties. It would appear that the *Times* is, in some respects, in touch with official sources which are not equally open to other newspapers. We submit that, if this is the case, the matter is of importance not merely to journalists but also to the public. The opinions and prejudices of the *Times*, and its mode of dealing with certain subjects—as, for example, Dr. Jameson's raid—are not such that the British public can willingly permit it even to seem to obtain the position of their official mouthpiece.

At the Empire of India Exhibition last year, as we learn from a report just issued, the directors are in a position to state that, from the actual percentages paid to them by exhibitors, the total sales of Indian goods were between £50,000 and £60,000, and they believe that incidental outside business, done on orders secured in the Exhibition, equalled at least another £25,000; or, in brief, that the Empire of Indian Exhibition of 1895 benefited Indian trade by a sum not to be calculated at less than £75,000. The directors express their pride that such favourable results have been achieved by a private company without any financial assistance from Government or State recognition of any kind.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

ELEVENTH SESSION.

"A BRILLIANT SUCCESS."

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)

POONA, *January 4th.*

The Eleventh Congress has passed off most successfully. Whatever fears may have been entertained as to the possibility of faction and division, they were not realized. The Congress was, on the contrary, a brilliant success.

We had well-nigh 1,600 delegates—400 more than the number at the Madras Congress. The local delegates mustered strong, but the number from outside Provinces was also very satisfactory. To-day's newspapers will give you a brief report of the three days' sittings. The speech of the President has been most favourably received in India by the Anglo-Indian press. Those who hoped that he would indulge in tirades and denunciations have been disappointed. Mr. Banerji had conceived the whole address in a spirit of splendid moderation. The matter and the manner of it were alike excellent. It occupied nearly three hours in delivery. Every word of it was orally repeated without a single moment's reference to the text—such is Mr. Banerji's marvellous memory. It was fortunate that we had the advantage of the presence of our friend, Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who had just arrived from England, and from whom we heard the latest news with reference to Indian affairs in England. He spoke on the separation of executive from judicial functions. In the brief space of time allotted to him he brought out all the salient points of the controversy. His speech made an excellent impression on the audience, though it must be said frankly that the delegates refused to endorse his hopes of co-operation on the part of Mr. Bhownaggree. There were hisses at first at the mention of Mr. Bhownaggree's name, until the President cried "Order!" Mr. Ghose's speech has already been put into pamphlet form. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, who is a general favourite, spoke with his usual sound sense and vigorous reasoning on the Jury Bill. Mr. P. M. Mehta made no speech. After the indictment he had hurled only a week before on the Bombay platform against the opponents of the Congress movement he refrained from attacking further his defeated antagonists. Mr. D. E. Wacha spoke to two resolutions. The first referred to military expenditure, on which Mr. Wacha controverted some further mis-statements of Sir James Westland's, and refuted the suggestion that savings might be looked for in the near future from improved exchange. The gist of his argument was that exchange was an unstable factor to depend upon, and that if permanent economies were to be made in Indian finances there must be a reduction of the overgrown civil and military expenditure. Exchange was a precarious factor, and financial statesmanship would never warrant reliance on sources of income and heads of expenditure of a precarious character like the opium revenue and exchange respectively. Mr. Wacha also spoke on the import duties. He observed that it remained to be seen how the cotton duties could be repealed in face of the crying complaint touching the enhanced duty on salt, which must on every ground claim priority. The cotton duties, he contended, could only be repealed by first disallowing the compensation allowance and by doubling the income-tax.

The Congress afterwards considered a set of draft rules. But as these were prepared on the eve of the Congress, and as none of the Standing Committees had had leisure to examine them, it was resolved that the Committees should express their opinion fully three months before the date of the next Congress, which is to be held in Calcutta.

We also discussed the South African question. Mr. Seymour Keay spoke to a resolution on the subject of the reactionary notification issued some time ago by the Government of India gagging the press in territories under British administration in Native States. There was, of course, a resolution on the Royal Commission which condemned its sitting with closed doors, and disapproved of the limited scope of the enquiry. The speeches on this resolution were good, each speaker discounting beforehand the final report. I trust that these speeches may have due effect upon the officials of the Commission. They will, at any rate, know that we Indians are convinced that from a Commission almost entirely composed of reactionaries, and acting under the inspiration of the India Office, little good can be expected. The frontier policy of the Government was vigorously attacked in an excellent speech by Mr. H. A. Wadia, the well-known Rajkot barrister. Our friend Dr. K. N. Bahadurji, returned to his

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

charge against the Army Medical Service. The question of Simultaneous Examinations was taken up in an able speech by Mr. Kali Charan Banerji, an old and staunch Congress-wallah. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will be glad to see that his favourite subject was not neglected. The President also had referred to it in his speech, and expressed the hope that our "Grand Old Man" might soon re-enter Parliament. Other resolutions were passed to which I need not refer in detail. A tribute of praise was given to Sir William Wedderburn, as the indefatigable chairman of the British Committee, for his unflagging efforts in the cause of India, and for his deep and abiding sympathy with our people. The resolution was carried with all honours—all the delegates rising to their feet and cheering vociferously. As it was felt that there should be a Joint Honorary Secretary in India, the Congress unanimously appointed Mr. D. E. Wacha to the post. The appointment has given universal satisfaction, as Mr. Wacha is recognised not only as one of the most zealous fighters in the Congress camp, but also as one of the most high-minded, trustworthy, and good-natured of men.

Everywhere the impression created by this year's Congress has been most favourable. It was a success, and a grand success. With the exception of the Bombay Congress of 1889, at which the ever to be lamented Mr. Bradlaugh was present, I do not think we have had such a splendid Congress. There were present three ex-presidents of weight and authority, Messrs. Bonnerjee, Mehta, and Ananda Charlu. We had besides Mr. Ghose, fresh from England with his impressions, we had many Sirdars of the Deccan, and we had many true men and good from the different provinces. The Muhammadans who spoke, spoke well, especially the old delegate named Ali Muhammed Bhimji. The number of visitors never abated. The average was fully four thousand daily. We had as many as 150 lady visitors—Parsis, Hindus, and Europeans. The Collector, the Police Superintendent, and the District Judge were on the platform. Their names are Messrs. Silcock, Kennedy, and Crowe respectively. The President in his concluding address gracefully referred to the assistance they rendered. The Reception Committee manfully did its task, especially as to the convenience and comforts of the guests. The young band of volunteers, 300 strong, also discharged their self-imposed duties with the greatest devotion, and were rewarded by the President with compliments at once genuine and hearty. They were mostly graduates and undergraduates. The President was also presented with addresses by the students, and he made a thoughtful and eloquent reply. Everywhere he made a most favourable impression by his well-balanced utterances. He spoke strongly in favour of social reform in the Congress camp, and displayed his warm sympathy by paying a personal visit to the camp of the promoters of the Social Conference and speaking there. The speech was warmly applauded. One of the most pleasant features of the Social Conference was the presence of a large number of Hindu ladies. Another was the speech of the Muhammadan delegate to whom I have just referred. He made a capital speech on the respective duties of Muhammadans and Hindus in bringing an end to the tension caused by the deplorable riots of the past two years in the Deccan. Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji paid a high tribute of praise to the perseverance, devotion, and truly Christian spirit of Mr. Justice Ranade, who is the soul of the Social Conference.

The following is, we believe, the accurate text of the resolutions adopted by the Congress:—

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

I.

That the draft rules in regard to the constitution and working of the Indian National Congress as framed by the Poona Congress Committee in accordance with the Resolution in that behalf of the last Congress be circulated by the Poona Committee to all the Standing Congress Committees with instructions to report to the General Secretary and Standing Counsel at least three months before the next Congress.

II.

That this Congress is of opinion that the enquiry by the Expenditure Commission will not be satisfactory to the people of this country, nor be of any practical advantage to the Government, unless the lines of policy which regulate expenditure are enquired into, and unless facilities are afforded and arrangements made for receiving evidence other than official and Anglo-Indian. And this Congress also feels that the enquiry would, in all probability, yield better results if the proceedings were conducted with open doors.

III.

That this Congress again records its firm conviction that, in view of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country, the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the Army Services and other military expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost of Civil Administration, and it notices with satisfaction that expert opinion in England has now come over to the view of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, that growth in military expenditure is a more potent cause of Indian financial embarrassment than the condition of exchange.

IV.

That this Congress again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take practical steps for the purpose of carrying out the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice.

V.

That this Congress views with alarm the constant changes that are being made and threatened on the subject of trial by jury in this country, and regard being had to the fact that no demand for any such change has been made from any portion of the population of British India, trusts that the Bill now before the Supreme Legislative Council will not be further proceeded with, and this Congress, reaffirming Resolutions passed by former Congresses, also trusts that trials by jury will be extended to districts and offences to which the system at present does not apply, and that their verdict should be final.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

VI.

That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June, 1891, in the Foreign Department, gagging the press in territories under British administration in Native States is retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, most respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the same, and entreats its cancellation without delay.

VII.

This Congress, concurring with previous Congresses, again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good results to the natives of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible, unless effect is given to the resolution of the House of Commons of June, 1893, in favour of holding the competitive examination for the Indian Civil Services simultaneously in India and England.

VIII.

In view of the great extensions of the British power on the North-West and North-East of the proper frontiers of India into regions not contemplated by Parliament when it passed Section 56 of the Government of India Act, the Congress is of opinion that over and above the sanction of Parliament necessary before the revenue and forces of India are employed outside the frontiers of India, the interests of India absolutely demand that the expenses of all such expeditions should be shared between England and India. Without some such additional guarantee, the forward military policy will involve India in hopeless financial confusion.

IX.

The Congress deems it necessary to record its most solemn protest against the disabilities sought to be imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and it earnestly hopes that the British Government and the Government of India will come forward to guard the interests of these settlers in the same spirit in which they have always interfered whenever the interests of their British-born subjects have been at stake.

X.

That in the opinion of this Congress any proposal to restrict the right of private alienation of lands by public Legislation as a remedy for the relief of agricultural indebtedness will be a most retrograde measure and will, in its distant consequences, not only check improvement, but reduce the agricultural population to a condition of still greater helplessness. The indebtedness of the agriculturist classes arises partly from their ignorance and partly from the application of a too rigid system of fixed revenue assessments, which takes little account of the fluctuating conditions of agriculture in many parts of India; and the true remedy must be sought in the spread of general education and a relaxation of the rigidity of the present system of revenue collections in those parts of the country where the permanent settlement does not obtain.

XI.

This Congress notes with satisfaction that the right of interpellation vested in non-official members of the Legislative Councils has, on the whole, been exercised in a spirit of moderation which has secured the approval of the authorities here and in England, and the Congress being of opinion that the practical utility of interpellations would be greatly enhanced if the members putting them were allowed to preface their questions by a short explanation of the reasons for them, urges that the right to make such explanations ought to be granted.

XII.

(*a*) That this Congress notices with satisfaction that its views in regard to the urgency and lines of reform in regard to the condition of the Civil and Military Medical services of the country are being endorsed in influential Medical and Military circles, and that in the interests of the public, Medical Science and the profession, as also in the cause of economic administration, this Congress affirms (1) that there should be only one Military Medical Service with two branches, one for the Europ-an army and another for native troops, worked on identical lines; (2) that the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted, a distinct and independent Medical Service wholly detached from its present Military connection and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere with a due leaning to the utilisation of indigenous talent, other things being equal.

(*b*) This Congress further affirms that the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants requires thorough and open enquiry, with a view to the redressing of long standing anomalies and consequent grievances; and the Congress notices with regret that in their recent scheme of reorganisation of the Chemical Analyser's department, the oft-admitted claims of Assistant Chemical Analysers have been apparently overlooked by Government.

XIII.

That this Congress while fully sympathising with any genuine effort which the Government may make for the suppression of law-touts, views with grave alarm those provisions of the Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners' Act now pending the consideration of the Supreme Legislative Council which propose to invest District Judges and Revenue Commissioners with the power of dismissing legal practitioners, and in cases coming under the Act, to throw the entire burden of proving their innocence upon the latter, and this Congress being of opinion that the provisions of the Bill are calculated to prejudicially affect the independence of the Bar and to lower the position of legal practitioners in the eyes of the public without in any way helping to suppress law-touts or to further the ends of justice, urges that it should be dropped.

XIV.

That this Congress expresses its firm conviction that in the interests of the country it is absolutely necessary that there should be greater fixity in the tenure on which land is held in the temporarily

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

settled districts than exists at present, and that Government should impose on its own action restrictions against enhancement of assessment similar to those which it has deemed necessary in the interests of tenants to impose upon the rights of private landlords in permanently settled estates.

XV.

This Congress puts on record its emphatic protest against the retrograde policy that the Government of India have this time followed in nominating a gentleman for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking local bodies to make recommendations for such nomination, and earnestly hopes that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Central Provinces the same kind of representation that it has already granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces.

XVI.

That this Congress repeats its protest of the last two years against the grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the undomiciled European and Eurasian *employés* of Government, involving now an annual expenditure of over a crore and a half of rupees.

XVII.

That this Congress, while thanking the Government of India for recognising the grievances of railway passengers in their recent resolutions on the subject, desires to express its hope that Government will take effective steps to bring about their redress.

XVIII.

This Congress is of opinion that the action of the Forest Department under the rules framed by the different Provincial Governments prejudicially affects the inhabitants of the rural parts of the country by subjecting them to the annoyance and oppression of forest subordinates in various ways, which have led to much discontent throughout the country. The objects of forest conservancy as announced in the resolution of 1894, are declared to be not to secure the largest revenue, but to conserve the forest in the interest, chiefly, of the agricultural classes and of their cattle. The existing set of rules subordinates the latter consideration to the former, and an amendment of the rules with a view to correct this mischief is, in the opinion of the Congress, urgently called for.

XIX.

That this Congress tenders its thanks to the Secretary of State for India for his promise of September last to take an early opportunity to reduce the salt duty, and, concurring with previous Congresses, once more places on record its sense of the great hardship which the present rate of salt taxation imposes upon the poorest classes of the country, a hardship which renders it incumbent on Government to take the first opportnnity to restore the duty to its level of 1888.

XX.

That this Congress is emphatically of opinion that it is inexpedient in the present state of education in the country that Government grants for Higher Education should in any way be withdrawn, and, concurring with previous Congresses, affirms in the most emphatic manner the importance of increasing public expenditure on all branches of education and the expediency of establishing technical schools and colleges.

XXI.

This Congress is of opinion that the objection taken by Lancashire manufacturers to the exemption of Indian yarns below twenties is not well-founded, and trusts that the Government of India will stand firm in its policy of levying import duties for revenue purposes, as such levy does not conflict in any way with principles of free trade.

XXII.

That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating:—

(*a*) The raising of the income tax taxable minimum from 500 to 1,000 rupees:

(*b*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all provincial administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105, of the despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of March, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages;

(*c*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*d*) The taking of immediate steps to improve the lot of the poorer classes in India, fully fifty millions of the population—a number yearly increasing—dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and several millions actually perishing, in every decade, by starvation.

(*e*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour: to ensure the liberal concession of licences wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops: and to make all licences, granted under the revised rules, of lifelong tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*f*) The establishment of military colleges in India, whereat, natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as commissioned or non-commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army;

(*g*) The organising throughout the more warlike races of the empire of a system of militia service;

(*h*) The authorising and stimulating of a wide-spread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India;

(*i*) The regulation of the imposition of the Water-cess by certain defined principles affording security to the rights of landowners and of persons investing money in land;

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

(*j*) The giving effect to the report of the Parliamentary members of the India Office Committee on the subject of the Rules, Orders, and Practices in Indian Cantonments, with regard to prostitution and contagious disease, and the endorsing of their conclusions:—

(i) That the system and incidental practices described in that Report, and the statutory rules, so far as they authorised or permitted the same did not accord with the plain meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons, of June 5th, 1888; and

(ii) That the only effective method of preventing these systematic malpractices is by express legislation.

XXIII.

That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and the cost of the Congress publication INDIA, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1896.

XXIV.

That this Congress hereby tenders its most grateful thanks to Sir W. Wedderburn and the other members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the present year.

XXV.

That this Congress re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., to be its General Secretary for the ensuing year.

XXVI.

That the Twelfth Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas Day, 1896, as may be later determined upon, at Calcutta.

"A MEANS OF LEARNING SOMETHING."

The *Manchester Guardian* (December 31st) wrote:—The annual meetings of the Indian National Congress, which is sitting this week at Poona, always have a remarkable effect on a large part—at least one-half—of the English political press. Perhaps it is because the meetings are not very fully reported. At any rate the reporters' notes are not accepted as evidence. The custom is rather for the leader writer to frame an imaginary Indian National Congress of his own and to discuss gravely the attributes with which it is endowed by himself. At the same time he frames a second imaginary Congress with entirely different attributes, and he solemnly or ironically lectures others for entertaining this vision. The vision which our Conservative journals firmly hold to be a reality seems to be that of a mass meeting of the Bengali Babus of Anglo-Indian fiction, talkative, greedy, and insincere, who agitate for universal suffrage in India with a view to their own political promotion and the undermining of pure and equal British administration in India. With this intelligent conception kept well in view, the British public is warned not to trust the assurances of those who represent the Congress movement as the final expression of the views and aspirations of all the peoples of India. For, to go no further, how can a body of Bengali Babus represent the Muhammadans of India, to say nothing of all the distinctions of Jains, Sikhs, Parsis, Marathas, Madrasis, and the rest? The weak points of this piece of teaching, which is delivered annually in almost the same terms, are, first, that the Congress is not what these writers imagine it to be, and, secondly, that the conception of it which they criticise as if it were the only alternative is not entertained by any intelligent person in this country or in India. The Congress, as a matter of fact, represents the political opinions of many of those natives of India who have leisure, English education, and a lively interest in politics—represents them, as it has been very well said, much as the Social Science Congress or the British Association represents the body of public opinion that is most keenly interested in social problems or scientific progress. No doubt millions of Indians have scarcely heard of it, and other millions have heard of it without any particular interest; it is so obvious that the Congress is not formally accredited by the whole body of Indian citizens that time should not be wasted in pointing the fact out. But that does not deprive its proceedings of interest and value. It is the constant lament of Indian officials that the minds of the people they govern are almost impenetrable to the individual European. It is one of the main difficulties of Indian administration that it is carried on in a kind of twilight in which the sharpest-sighted Europeans can sometimes be scarcely sure that what they offer as a helping-hand will not be mistaken for a threat or a blow. Well, here at least is a means of learning something. It has been our policy to put a vast number of Indians, Hindu and Muhammadan, in the way of obtaining an education and the means which it offers of formulating and expressing opinions and feelings. When they make use of the means which have been afforded them, only the very dullest politician would ignore the indications thus given of the thoughts that are current in the minds of at least a large number of Indians, and those the Indians who are best equipped to influence their countrymen. Here we have been debating for nearly a year the Chitral affair and the whole question of Indian foreign policy which it involves, and every third word in the discussion on both sides has implied some assumption as to native Indian feeling. The forward party have been appealing to the Government not to damage British prestige in native eyes. We ourselves have been far more afraid of damaging this country in the eyes of India by guarding against fanciful dangers at the cost of oppressive taxation. When we are all assuming that India thinks something, and implying that the nature of her thoughts is of extreme importance in the framing of our policy, we should surely not ignore the few opportunities there are of finding what any part of the population does think. On Saturday the Congress condemned the occupation of Chitral, and no doubt the full report will show that impatience of the financial burdens imposed by the forward policy was the feeling that led to this vote. Of course such a

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

vote has not the value of a *referendum* vote taken throughout British India on the question. It does not represent everything. Still is represents something, and it probably represents a great deal, for it would be extravagant to suppose that the educated and politically active Indians who man the Congress have in some strange way isolated themselves from the mass of their countrymen and adopted opinions not generally current among those for whose support they appeal. A great deal of rather cheap ridicule has been spent on the Congress movement in favour of representative government. There would be less if it were known how small an interval separates the reforms which have been actually adopted and proposed by the Indian Government from those for which the Congress asks. The election of representatives on the Provincial Legislative Council in Bengal by the municipalities of each division differs very little from the schemes of representation, usually through the medium of electoral colleges, which the National Congress "agitators" have put forward during the last few years. We do not exclude the elective system in India now, and the Congress does not ask for its indefinite extension. There is a strong feeling in this country that though the complete subjection of India to British rule has been more beneficent than its earlier subjections to selfish or ignorant tyranny, still the subjection has been too complete to satisfy the conscience of a country which has made perfect self-government its own political ideal. No sane person overlooks the difficulty of making self-government on a great scale work well in India. But it is the direction in which we must tend, and by educating the natives of India we are teaching them to look in that direction too. Meanwhile, if proper attention is given to such expressions of Indian opinion on specific questions as are audible even now serious trouble may be avoided. We ought of our own motion to have refrained from saddling the Indian taxpayers with a part of the cost of English and Irish garrisons under the head of "Home Charges" for the Indian army. We ought not to have made India pay for the India Office in London when we did not venture to make the colonies pay for the Colonial Office. When things like this are done in the absence of any effective representation of popular opinion, they may give to a movement in favour of political changes the bitterness of a movement of protest against extortion.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON THE CRISIS.

While everybody is thanking the German Emperor for revealing once more the loyalty of our colonies in times of stress and strain, it occurred to me (wrote a representative of *The Star* on January 16th) that it would be interesting to learn the views of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who represents in a unique way the opinions and sentiments of our millions of Indian fellow-subjects.

"I can say without hesitation," replied Mr. Naoroji to my enquiries, "that the Indians would stand staunch and loyal to England—unless, indeed, some very unfortunate mistake were made by the authorities. There are undoubtedly many grave evils in the present system of administration in India, but the people of India fully understand and highly appreciate the benefits of their connection with this country. They believe also that, sooner or later, when the British public comes to be conversant with Indian affairs, the evils are sure to be remedied. It is in the long persistence of those evils that danger lies."

"There is," I said, "a large amount of fighting power in India?"

"Quite so. You have in India an amount of fighting power which England can utilise in any part of the world, and which it would be no child's play to resist. You have in the Sikhs, the Rajputs, the Marathas, and all the martial races, Hindu or Muhammadan, a warlike breed of some thousands of years. Its total strength is not far short of two-thirds of the whole fighting power of Europe. Lord Beaconsfield seemed to understand this, and it was a good stroke to bring Indian soldiers to Malta. You have employed them in Africa, in China, and in other parts of the world. But England should pay fairly for whatever she takes from India that is to her interest. She should not throw all the burden upon India, as she does in frontier wars like Chitral, and in many other ways."

Reviews.

POOR INDIA.

The Poverty Problem in India. Being a dissertation on the Causes and Remedies of Indian Poverty. By PRITHWIS CHANDRA RAY. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Bombay: Thacker & Co., Limited. London: W. Thacker & Co., 87, Newgate Street.)

There is now no real question whether or not India is a poor country. Everybody that has any knowledge of the facts admits that India is poor; and those that know the facts most intimately acknowledge that the poverty of India is intense and grinding, and widespread, and—what is of still more serious import—continually increasing. Mr. Ray complains, not without grounds, that the subject "has not hitherto been approached from the standpoint of practical politics, though discussions of side issues have frequently been indulged in in this quarter or that." It is just a little hard on the Indian National Congress when he says it "has done little more than pass vague and meaningless resolutions on this question." A little hard, and unjust: for the most recent efforts of the British Committee have been energetically directed, not fruitlessly either, against the most dangerous canker gnawing the roots of Indian prosperity. But we are not going to quarrel with Mr. Ray on that ground; we will content ourselves with remarking that he ought to have known better. As Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter says, in an introductory letter to the author, "in the range of Indian politics there is no subject which is of more vital importance this. . . . on a practical solution of this

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Problem our political advancement chiefly depends." Whether the remedies suggested by Mr. Ray would prove effective or not—and we shall presently see what they are—we can at any rate agree with Mr. Justice Mitter that he has "done a great service by clearly setting forth the nature of the disease with which we have to grapple." This, in fact, was done years ago, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in the most convincing manner, when he whipt Sir Grant Duff so exemplarily in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*. Mr. Ray's welcome volume will, we trust, draw fresh attention to the all-important and pressing question.

India is substantially a land of agriculturists. The country, it may be said, is the peasantry. Even Sir Charles Elliott, who will not be suspected of conspiracy with the Indian National Congress, did "not hesitate to say that half of our agricultural population never know, from year's end to year's end, what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied." And "half of our agricultural population" means something like 100,000,000 of men, women, and children. Mr. Ray cites numerous testimonies. Let the following suffice:

"The late Agricultural Reporter to the Government of Madras, Mr. Robertson, says of the Indian peasant in general: 'In the best seasons, the gross income of himself and his family does not exceed 3d. per day throughout the year, and in a bad season their circumstances are most deplorable.' Less than 8s. for a whole family for a month! An English day labourer or a factory operative would earn more than that in a week, working for a much shorter time. And when we remember that, however cheap living may be in India, it cannot be managed under the most favourable circumstances at less than Rs.2-8 a month per head, and that an average Indian family consists of 5·4 persons, as revealed in the last census, it is really a puzzle to understand how they can make the two ends meet. But alas! the two ends never meet, for even in the best of times, according to the most reliable authorities, 40,000,000 people always remain on the actual verge of starvation!"

No matter what deductions may be made, within the widest reason, from these appalling estimates, there must nevertheless remain a heart-breaking amount of misery from sheer hunger and the inevitable sickness consequent upon hunger. Why is it so? Mr. Ray sets forth a series of reasons. Excess of population, say some. Well, India is somewhat more densely populated per square mile than France; but it is less densely populated than Germany, Italy, and China, much less densely than Holland, and not nearly half so densely as England or Belgium. But, it must be admitted, the average is deceptive. For in some localities there is fearful congestion: "the density of population varies from 930 to the square mile in Northern Behar to 4 in Upper Burmah." The excess, where there is excess, lies in inequality of distribution; and, in view of the attachment of the people to their own districts, the remedy is by no means easy. Another cause is alleged to be the high cost of living, resulting from exportation of staple food-grains. Rice, the staple food-grain of about a third of the Indian people, is stated by Mr. Ray to be about four times as dear as it was half a century ago. At the same time, wages and agricultural profits have not increased proportionately. Again: "Our peasantry are being ground down under the cruel exactions of the intermediary revenue collectors whom our Government has created and fostered." Then there is the extortionate enhancement of rent on every fresh Settlement—a practice that has driven the people to riot in some places, and that has been strongly deprecated by high official authorities. "Taking a defaulter's family at only 4 on an average, we find that about 3,250,000 people, or one-eighth of the whole agricultural population of the Madras Presidency, have been sold out of house and home within the course of only eleven years, and for the simple offence of their having been unable to meet the high land revenue demands of the Government!" How much better are the other provinces? Dr. Voelcker charges the Indian agriculturist with want of enterprise. Others point to extravagance in weddings or *sradh* ceremonies, indiscriminate charity, and the joint family system, habits of drinking, eternal litigation, floods, droughts, and blights, and so forth. Mr. Ray reviews history, and finds that the Indian rayat has always been poor, and that under British administration his poverty has only deepened. We summarise Mr. Ray's remedial proposals:

1. Fix the land revenue in perpetuity universally, and check the growth of landlordism.
2. Raise the status of the peasantry by giving them some such additional rights as were conferred by the Irish Land Laws from 1870 downwards.
3. Establish agricultural banks in all important rural and urban centres.

Relieve congested districts by migration or emigration—especially by founding a colony "somewhere within the Empire"; and place effectual checks "upon the unreasonable multiplication of the peasant classes."

5. Spread around knowledge of agriculture. Let the Government start more works of irrigation, drainage, and embankments.
6. Revivify the *panchayet*, and introduce a Poor Law.
7. Readjust and reduce taxation, direct and indirect.

These proposals, on their very face, suggest abundant points of criticism, but we leave the reader to see for himself what Mr. Ray has to say about each of them.

Mr. Ray's first chapter is devoted to a polemic against free trade in favour of protection. He has put his weakest foot first. On this head we must hold him to be completely mistaken. His second chapter deals in a very interesting way with "Indian Arts and Manufactures," but it is vitiated by a strong admixture of protectionist ideas. We have just dealt with his valuable third chapter, and now pass on to the final chapter, in which he considers

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES, SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

certain "immediate causes" of the poverty of India. "The incidence of taxation—herein lies the greater canker. It is at once both unequal and insidious, and is sufficient to condemn 'the yoke of the foreigner'." The salt tax, which ranks next to land revenue in yield, is admittedly a most serious grievance. "Upon every seer of salt he consumes the agriculturist or the labourer has to pay a duty of one anna clear. . . . . A sense of deep wrong is rankling in the hearts of our plebeian class, which it is not entirely safe to ignore." The income tax hits the poorer middle class, with incomes over Rs. 500 a year; and perhaps three-fourths of all those that fall under the tax have incomes ranging from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000 a year. But "if one were to compare the expenses of an Englishman with £150 a year (less than this is not taxed in England) with those of a Hindu with Rs. 500, it will prove very much to the disadvantage of the latter." The land tax "is being daily increased by fleecing our agricultural population"; this has already been referred to. Further, says Mr. Ray:—

"Our Government can lay no moral claim upon our land, for the security to life and property it pretends to confer upon our agricultural population is a mere statute-book security, it being almost powerless to check the tremendous growth of the spirit of lording it over to be met with everywhere in the country. An English cultivator is satisfied to get his money's value in the shape of the strong protection which he receives from the hands of those to whom he pays his taxes, so much so that the fact that his house is his castle has almost passed into a proverb. And here, after a century and a half of English rule, the lower classes find that they are more helpless now than they ever were before. In order, therefore, to justify this tax, our Government must make the landowning classes and the Anglo-Indian community feel that no violent hand can ever be laid, not only in the light of day, but also in the darkness of night, upon either the person or the purse or the possessions of the rayat with impunity."

Mr. Ray pronounces a justly severe condemnation on the extravagant military expenses. He also complains of the heavy cost of the Civil Services, and finds it "impossible to condemn in too strong terms the reckless way in which public money is spent" in the Public Works Department. As to the latter, "underhand jobbery and thoughtless waste are almost everyday affairs under its ægis. Lord Mayo characterized some of the expenditure of this department as 'a recklessness little short of robbery'."

The first thing to be done, no doubt, is to limit expenditure rigorously at all points, where this is possible without cramping the energies of the country. At the same time, there is required a firm hand upon the spirit of frontier policy and military adventure. The next thing is the guidance of the forces thus conserved into the direction of material development of the country. Given a prosperous population, the finances would soon recover their elasticity. If the obvious and wise policy were once thoroughly in train, not only would poverty soon disappear from the land, but there would be an opening for English trade and English enterprise absolutely astonishing. When will English constituencies open their eyes to the selfish view of Indian poverty? If they could but see the possibilities of trade open to them with a prosperous India, surely they would promptly make an end of frontier expeditions and "ignoble little wars," and insist on a government of India in accordance with the principles of justice and reason, which at the same time would bring prosperity to India and increased prosperity to England.

A GUJARATI GRAMMAR.

The Students' Gujarati Grammar, with Exercises and Vocabulary. By G. P. TAYLOR, M.A., B.D., Irish Presbyterian Mission, Gujarat. (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., Ltd.)

"The Students' Gujarati Grammar," compiled by Mr. G. P. Taylor, will be welcomed by European students who wish to learn Gujarati in these days when the importance of the Indian vernaculars is widely recognised. Nearly a score of Gujarati grammars have been written since the beginning of the present century for the English student, and, though most of them have individual merits, the need has long been felt for one that might enable him to begin the study of the language without the aid of a teacher. That the present volume will be regarded as a text-book, there can be little doubt. The author has lived for many years in Gujurat, freely mixing with all classes of people, and has had advantages which preceding writers could not enjoy. The plan of the book is commendable. Mr. Taylor has succeeded in securing accuracy and simplicity, and has given a great deal of useful and interesting information in the limited space at his disposal. The seven appendices and five paradigms that precede the exercises and vocabulary will be found useful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JANUARY, 1896.

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Gaikwad, Shrimant Sampatrao, "Travel." Pope, Dr. G. U., "Leaves from an Old Indian's Note Book." "Sketch of a Travancore Girls' School."

MINSTER. Temple, Sir R., "Some Great Men in India."

PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Forrest, G. W., "Calcutta."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. White, Col. S. Dewe, "My First Battle in the Indian Mutiny."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JANUARY, 1896.

MONTGOMERY, EDMUND W. ..... "Indian Railway Companies, 1896." (Fred. C. Mathieson and Sons, and Effingham Wilson, London)	
BURROWS, MONTAGUE ..... "The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain." (Wm. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh.) ..	12s. 0d.
"Report of the Empire of India Exhibition, 1895." Illustrated. (Printed by Spiers and Pond)..	— —
AN (ANGLO-INDIAN) OPTIMIST ..... "Essays *Fin de Siècle*." (Allahabad, the *Pioneer* Press) ..	— —
BEYNON, LIEUT. W. G. L. ..... "With Kelly to Chitral." Illustrated. (Edward Arnold)	7s. 6d.
GRAY, JOHN ALFRED, M.B. ..... "At the Court of the Amir." (Richard Bentley and Son)	16s. 0d.
GRIBBLE, J. D. B. ..... "A History of the Deccan," Vol. I. (Luzac and Co.) ..	21s. 0d.

Printed by A. RONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 3. (NEW SERIES.) MARCH, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	65
The Jingo Revival, by A. E. Fletcher	71
The Indian Outlander, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	72
Judicial and Executive Functions in India, by A. Nundy	74
The Secretary of State's Drafts, by W. M. W.	76
Political and Social Reform in India	77
Correspondence: The Congress and the Anglo-Indian Press	80
The Opening of Parliament	81
The Chitral Amendment: The Nescience of Lord G. Hamilton	82
Railways in India: A Heavy Financial Loss	84
Our London Letter	85
The Chitral Debate: Division List	87
"The Chitral Blunder"	87
The Máhárája of Jhalwar	88
The Judiciary and the Executive in India: Memorandum by the British Committee	90
The Ninth Social Conference: Text of the Resolutions	91
Reviews: The Story of the Deccan	92
"The Valley of Kashmir"	94
Mr. Harold Spender's Story	96
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	96
Recent Official Publication	96

Indiana.

India and the Queen's Speech.

The Queen's Speech, which was delivered by the Lords Commissioners to both Houses of Parliament on February 11th, contained, contrary to custom, more than one paragraph relating to India. "On the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire, the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been," so "my lords and gentlemen" were assured, "successful, and the engagements entered into by the border tribes for the maintenance and protection of the road from Peshawar have been loyally carried out without molestation or disturbance." The phraseology of this announcement is curious and important. It was understood, or, to speak more strictly, it was stated last year that the expedition which was sent to Chitral was intended solely to relieve Dr. Robertson. The Viceroy's proclamation to the people of Swat and Bajaur expressly declared that as soon as that object had been attained the force would be withdrawn. "There is," the proclamation added, "no intention of permanently occupying the country passed through." This language contrasts oddly and significantly with "the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral." More than that, the Queen's Speech declared that the measures in question were taken "on the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire." Is Chitral, then, in the opinion of the present Cabinet, on the frontier, and not beyond it? If so, when and how was the frontier extended to Chitral? And was the procedure which was adopted in accordance with the Act of 1858? Section 55 of that Act provides as follows:—"Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by Her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." When was this consent obtained? And will the Government kindly state—for it appears to know—where exactly "the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire" now is? The Indian taxpayer, who bears the brunt of the "forward" policy, will compare, not without bitterness, the language of the Queen's Speech, 1896, with the language of the Queen's Proclamation, 1858:—

QUEEN'S PROCLAMATION, 1858.	QUEEN'S SPEECH, 1896.
We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions; and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity, we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others.	*On* the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been successful.

The remarkable thing is that, in the opening debate on the Address, the Liberal leaders made no mention of the reversal of their policy in Chitral by their

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

successors. Lord Rosebery, in the House of Lords, and Sir W. Harcourt, in the House of Commons, delivered speeches which surveyed the world from China to Peru, but neither of them had one word of protest to utter against "the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral." Are we to assume that the Liberal leaders have not the courage of their convictions? Or is justice to India a matter of no importance in their eyes?

The Chitral Amendment.

It was left for Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and his colleagues of the Indian Parlamentary Committee to do what Sir Henry Fowler ought to have done. On February 17th, Sir William moved an amendment to the Address in the following terms:—

"But we humbly express our regret that the present Government, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have decided not to withdraw from Chitral, thereby violating the pledge expressly given in the Viceroy's proclamation, dangerously adding to Government responsibilities beyond the north-west frontier of India and inevitably leading to an increase of the overgrown expenditure in the Indian Military Department, and, further, our regret that the treaty of 1893 with the Amír of Afghanistan has not been placed before Parliament."

The sudden collapse of the debate on Venezuela caused the Chitral amendment to be reached earlier than had been expected, with the result that Sir W. Wedderburn's seconder and many other members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, to whom a "whip" had been issued, were not in their places. A less unfortunate result was that there was a good House to hear the irresistible logic of facts which Sir W. Wedderburn presented in a pithy and pointed speech. He knew, of course, that the best he could hope for was a moral victory, and that victory he easily obtained. Lord George Hamilton, alike by the manner and the matter of his defence, confirmed the strength of Sir William's position. The Secretary of State for India is neither an orator nor a debater, and the weakness of his arguments was not by any means concealed by the strength of lung with which his party "items" backed him up. In fact, Lord George was rather angry. He asserted that Sir W. Wedderburn "had not mastered the rudiments of the question," that he was "absolutely wrong," that his case was a pure concoction from beginning to end," and that it was "not based on one iota of fact." Cabinet ministers have hitherto left pleasantries of this kind in the undisputed possession of the baser sort of attorney. What Lord George Hamilton utterly failed to show was that any one of the contentions put forward in the amendment was contrary to fact. Those contentions were:

(i) That the retention of Chitral violates the pledge given in the Viceroy's proclamation;
(ii) That it angerously adds to Government responsibilities beyond the north-west frontier; and
(iii) That it must inevitably lead to an increase of Indian military expenditure.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

The Discomfiture of Lord G. Hamilton.

How did Lord George Hamilton meet these contentions? One has only to read his speech carefully through to see that he made no pretence of meeting them at all. Let us take the third point—the increase of expenditure—first. Unlike former apologists for the policy of occupation, Lord George Hamilton admitted that some increase was inevitable. He merely expressed the hope that it would be "less than was anticipated." What this hope is worth may be judged from the examples cited by Sir W. Wedderburn—the Abyssinian war, which was estimated at three millions, cost 10 millions, and the Afghan war, which was estimated at 1¾ millions, cost 21 millions. As to the first two contentions—that the policy of retention is a breach of faith, and is dangerous—Lord George merely evaded them. He did, indeed, state that the Viceroy's proclamation "had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral," but that statement only leads us to doubt whether Lord George Hamilton has ever read the proclamation. It is to be found at page 39 of the Chitral Blue-book, and it contains two distinct undertakings:

(i) "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and, *as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn.*"

(ii) "The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes."

Now, it is obvious that the first of these two promises is a promise *to withdraw from Chitral*, and it does not matter whether it was addressed to the people of Swat or the people of Timbuctoo. But we go, as they say in the House of Commons, one step further. The date of this Proclamation (see Blue-book, p. 39) is March 14th. It was issued on the receipt of Sir H. Fowler's telegraphic despatch, No. 25 (Blue-book, p. 34), in these terms:

"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary."

Moreover, when, on March 15th, the Viceroy informed Sir H. Fowler that orders had been issued for the mobilisation of the first division of the field army, the latter at once telegraphed:

"Please let me know why so large a force is considered necessary for securing safety of Robertson and party."

Three days later the Viceroy replied:

"Large force is required on account of necessity for holding line of communication in great force, and to meet possible hostility of both Mohmands and Swats and other frontier tribes."

There is not a word here about the policy of occupation which Lord George Hamilton now declares "has been an unmixed success." It is an unmixed breach of faith, and no irrelevant talk about the richness of the country or the docility of the people can obscure the fact. We deal more at length with the question elsewhere. Here we will only express our astonish-

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ment at the fact that Sir Henry Fowler, whose policy was so hastily reversed by Lord George Hamilton, was absent from both the debate and the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment. The amendment was supported by 79 members—a notable increase on the 28 who voted in the same sense with Mr. Maclean last September. The people of India will observe with amusement, though without surprise, that Mr. Bhownaggree, who voted for Mr. Maclean's amendment in September, voted against Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment on February 17th.

Danger Ahead in Chitral.

We have not done with Chitral yet. Notwithstanding the optimism of the Queen's Speech, and the confident declaration of Cabinet Ministers that the occupation of the country will not add a rupee to Indian military expenditure, authorities who are able to take a closer view bid us look out for squalls. The *Pioneer*, for example, commenting on the forthcoming Budget statement, wrote on January 23rd that on the expenditure side there is one huge item for which provision was not made :—

"We refer to the cost of the Chitral Relief expedition. This has been commonly taken at two crores of rupees, and it certainly will not exceed this, for the figures now work out to about 193 lakhs. . . . . If we mistake not, some 22 lakhs only were budgeted for last March on account of Chitral. So that the expenditure of between 120 and 180 lakhs must be classed as extraordinary. As we said some time ago, the improvement in exchange and the saving under the head of opium will enable the Government to bear this heavy war charge with equanimity."

The equanimity of the Government, which calls the tune, is one thing ; the distress of the taxpayer, who pays the piper, is another. Extravagance in the military department of the Government of India finds its natural counterpart in the high rate of the salt-tax, in oppressive enhancements of land revenue, in the starvation of public works, and the neglect of education. Nor is that all. The *Pioneer*, in its issue of January 16th, points out that, although the congeries of tribes beyond the Peshawar border have hitherto remained on their best behaviour since the withdrawal of the Field Force," in the spring the reality of their apparent acceptance of the new position will be tested." The *Pioneer* adds :—

"In the arrangement made with the Swat elders and the Khan of Dir it was distinctly laid down that the troops moving to and from Chitral would travel by the new road, and no surprise, therefore, will be sprung upon the tribesmen when the reliefs are ordered. The question is whether the reappearance of our Sepoys marching from Chakdarah to Drosh will cause any unrest among the fanatical section of the population, and whether any attempt will be made to intercept the regiments as they move from post to post."

We are warned that "one can never be certain as to the temper of the tribes, or as to what outside influence may be at work," and already a postal runner has been killed.

Mr. Bayard on Moral Force.

At a time when the cheap heroics of the music-hall and of our newest Poet Laureate are so obtrusive, it is refreshing to come across a speech so sane and wholesome as that which Mr. Bayard, the American Ambassador, delivered at the Whitehall Rooms on February 6th. Mr. Bayard is no idolater of militarism. He sees a nation's ultimate strength not in material but in moral force :—

"The hearts of men who love England have been lately stirred to consider the true forces of England—how England should be continued and strengthened. The common and patriotic turn of thought has been to the armed forces, to your great ships, to your brave army, to the stout hearts and to the earnest consciences of your people ; but, believe me, there are other forces that make and keep a people that are not noisy, though all the more powerful. (Cheers.) Therefore to-night I venture to ask your special attention to the most important sources of the strength of your country, which, by making your country strong, shall make mine strong also. (Cheers.) I mean those fountains of moral force which are the true basis of the world's advancement and forward movement. (Cheers.)"

These unexceptionable sentiments, as we see, excited popular applause. But there are, doubtless, cynical persons who will reflect that Mr. Balfour also excited popular applause when he laid down the startling maxim that where the British soldier has set his foot, there he must remain—a maxim, by the way, which Lord Salisbury seems to have overlooked in Siam. Even soldiers like Lord Roberts are ready to avow—in their speeches—that Great Britain holds, and can only hold, India by the ties of justice, not by the power of the sword. But there is sometimes so glaring a contrast between words and deeds. At any rate, the British army in India is not reduced, while we demonstrate our moral force by violating our proclamation in the case of Chitral. On paper, again, Dr. Jameson's raid is condemned. But it seems to have had the effect of attracting an unprecedented degree of attention to the grievances of the Uitlanders ; whereas Ireland, as Mr. Dillon points out, is said to be indifferent to Home Rule because she refrains from outrage. Mr. Bayard's lesson, we fear, is not yet fully learned in this best of all possible worlds.

A Specimen "Moral Effect."

We turn from Mr. Bayard's remarks to the account which is given by the *Pioneer* of the operations in Lushai-land. We called attention in January to the despatch of a punitive expedition to this territory, which during the past few years has, without apparent cause, increased by more, than eight millions of rupees the military expenditure of the Government of India. "The band," says the *Pioneer*, "enlivened the departure by playing a selection of inspiriting tunes, which were frequently interrupted by the ringing cheers of the sepoys, who thus testified their joy at finding themselves

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

once more on the war-path." The expedition seems to have lived up to this spirited beginning:—

"On 26th December we offered the following terms to the Chiefs Kairuma, Jaduna, and Kaphleya. Kairuma, whose village is by far the largest, numbering over 500 houses, was to pay a fine of 80 guns, Jaduna and Kaphleya between them 60 guns, and these latter were further informed that they must send 80 coolies to work for 10 days at Fort Tregear. The fines were to be paid on the 29th. Should they fail to obey these orders, on the 30th parties would be sent out to harry the people and burn the rice. In order to carry out this work of destruction the more efficiently, it was decided that the Burma column, consisting of six officers and 100 rifles, should join us here on the 27th."

There was some delay in bringing in the guns, and the "rice-destroying operations" began. But the expedition soon found "more congenial work" in hunting an "old enemy," Jacopa, at Mwellon. The gallant expedition, not deterred from their quest by "five men who were apparently busy catching rats for their supper," easily found and arrested Jacopa and, while the officers took tea, the men "hunted around for spoils to carry away as momentoes of the night's work." The edifying story proceeds:—

"At 1.45, an hour and a half after we had so cautiously sneaked into the village, we boldly and victoriously marched out of it having previously fired all except three of the houses. These three we spared, as a brother of the man who had so ably guided us to Jacopa's retreat lived in one of them, and we could not be so ungrateful as to burn his house with the rest, so found we also had to spare those on either side, as they were also so close together, that if one were fired it would burn the other also. We left the blazing village with a hope that it would serve as a warning to all of the fate that was in store for all villages which harboured our enemies."

On the return journey our brave warriors were "hampered with the various articles" which they had "brought away as momentoes". But they got safely back, without being startled by any more rat-catchers, and "as no more guns had been brought in, we had to again send forth parties to destroy grain, and this time a large quantity was burned." The closing reflection is sublime:—

"Though of fighting there has been none, and we have not had any opportunity of showing them our superiority in that way, yet we have shown them that the power rests with us, and I fancy the moral effect produced . . . . is one that will not soon pass away."

It is perhaps a pity that these inspiriting descriptions of British valour on the war-path do not find their way into English newspapers. They might tend to abate our humiliation in respect of Armenia.

Uitlanders and India.

The article which Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., contributed to our last number upon "Uitlanders and India: The Mote and the Beam," should be read in connexion with Mr. Chamberlain's despatch to President Kruger, suggesting a scheme of Home Rule for the Rand, and the recent debates on the Transvaal question in the House of Commons. Whole passages from the speeches and the despatch apply *mutatis mutandis* with far greater force to the taxpayers of India than to the Uitlanders in the Transvaal. The latter have, at any rate, migrated to a country not their own, and their claim is that the constitution of that country should be so modified as to give them a share of civic authority. With the taxpayers of India the case is different. In their native land they are debarred from any real and effective control over the expenditure for which they are compelled to make provision. Can we wonder that educated Indians resent their disabilities, and the insolence which is sometimes added to them? "We can," Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta said at Bombay last December, "represent the great masses of the people, and we can enunciate their grievances and the measures for redressing them. We can ask for a reduction of the salt tax in their interest; we can ask for a lighter assessment of the land; we can ask for them economy and reduction of expenditure, and we can point out that nothing is more responsible for squandering the revenues of the country than the military policy which has again come into favour since 1884-85." But with what sort of answer are such representations met? Are they welcomed by the ruling class, which absorbs every year in salaries and pensions so large a tribute from the Indian people? On the contrary, they are too often received with contumely, and their authors denounced as agitators and sowers of sedition. Is it not strange that the British public should be so tender to Uitlanders, who foment armed invasion of the territory of a friendly State, and so indifferent to the moderate demands of our Indian fellow-subjects in their own country? "Unfortunately," said Mr. Chamberlain on February 13th, amid ironical cheers from the Irish members, "in all these matters we are living, as it were, in a glass house." We are indeed. But no good can come of closing our eyes and ears against facts. "It is not in our power," Mr. Chamberlain said, "to protect the Republic of the Transvaal from internal weakness; and there will be internal weakness so long as the causes of discontent remain." What is true in this sense of the Transvaal is true also of India. But the policy of military bureaucrats not only ignores internal discontent but actually aggravates it by squandering Indian resources upon costly measures of futile defence far beyond the frontier.

The Judiciary and the Executive.

A Memorandum upon the Separation of Judicial from Executive (especially police and revenue) Duties in India has just been issued by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress to members of both Houses of Parliament. Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has also forwarded to the Secretary of State for India a copy of the document, which contains, in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

addition to Mr. Ghose's statement, the series of authoritative opinions contributed to our columns by Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Garth, Sir Richard Couch, Sir J. B. Phear, Sir R. T. Reid, Sir William Markby and Sir Raymond West. The scheme of separation suggested by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt in India for August, 1893, is also included, and the compilation is prefaced with a brief introductory note which we reproduce on another page. The immediate object of the publication is to draw attention to what has long been a burning question in India. If it should fail to accomplish this purpose, further steps will be necessary, and will undoubtedly be taken. There is not a word to be said in favour of the existing system. It would not be tolerated for a moment in the United Kingdom, and the many scandals to which it has given rise tend to cast discredit upon the general administration of justice in India. The reform of a system under which the policeman and the detective is also the judge is demanded alike by public opinion in India and by every authority who is concerned for the good name of the Judiciary. The modest suggestion of the British Committee is that a practical experiment should be made in a single division, where the "counsel of perfection," as Lord Dufferin called it, could be adopted without any risk of large increase of expenditure. It is not easy to see what plausible answer, except a ready affirmative, can be given by the India Office to so tentative and practical a proposal.

The "New" Diplomacy.

After the "new" journalism, the "new" drama, and the "new" woman, we have now the "new" diplomacy. The inventor, it is almost superfluous to say, is Mr. Chamberlain. The "new" diplomacy has the defects of its qualities, but it is, on the whole, much better than the old. Even the *St. James's Gazette* has vouchsafed a word of commendation to Mr. Chamberlain's refusal to stand upon the ancient ways:—

"As for frankness in the publication of documents, the Colonial Secretary admits that he has carried it to the verge of indiscretion. It is, as he said, a new method of diplomatizing. For our part, we think it is a good one. There is too much mystery and moonshine, too much reticence and false pretence, about our public affairs altogether. In these days, when sooner or later the nations have to decide great issues, it is just as well that the nations should know, whenever it is possible, what their rulers are doing, and what they intend."

Anglo-Indian journals, please copy. Secrecy and silence have hitherto been two of the most important and, we must add, the most sinister weapons of the Government of India. Mr. Chamberlain's publication of his scheme of Home Rule for the Rand gave offence to President Kruger, because the scheme had not previously received his approval. "If," said Mr. Chamberlain, "I have done wrong, it is a lesson to persons who endeavour to diplomatize on new methods; but, at all events, I shall be discharged from any imputation of bad faith in the matter." Exactly; and the usefulness of publicity in the ninety-nine cases is worth the risk of a *contretemps* in the hundredth. Mr. Balfour, in his speech at Manchester last January, bore significant testimony to the excellence of the method. At the close of his remarks upon the Venezuelan question, he said:—

"Surely, with all this mass of material before the public of both countries, it will be hard indeed if the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race is not able to settle any point in dispute without the arbitrament of war."

The "new" diplomatist who had recourse to publicity in that case was not Lord Salisbury, but President Cleveland—a fact which rather increases the significance of Mr. Balfour's testimonial. The "new" diplomacy is also ready to do justice to Civil Servants. Mr. Chamberlain, in the House of Commons on February 13th, mentioned by name, and with expressions of high praise, Mr. Fairfield, of the Colonial Office, who, he said, "knows, I fancy, more about South African affairs than probably any other living man." It is one of life's little ironies that, while the able civilian remains concealed in the background, the case which he has prepared, or the report which he has drawn up, is presented, and badly presented, by some tedious figurehead in the House of Commons.

Sir H. Fowler at Wolverhampton.

When Sir Henry—or, as he then was, Mr.—Fowler was appointed Secretary of State for India in the spring of 1894 we wrote:—

"Among other characteristics which have gone to make Mr. Fowler's reputation is his scrupulous anxiety to conciliate opponents. If he is hardly a conspicuous exponent of the *fortiter in re* he has cultivated sedulously the *suaviter in modo*. . . . . But there is a point at which conciliation and compromise, besides disarming opponents, begin to alienate supporters. . . . . In dealing with the India Council and the Government of India a new broom that wishes to sweep clean is likely to meet with a minimum of support and a maximum of opposition. The velvet glove is, in these circumstances, worse than useless unless it covers the iron hand. It has been said of Mr. Fowler that he will never initiate a great policy or lead a forlorn hope. Perhaps this judgment is a hasty generalisation from particulars. Now, at any rate, Mr. Fowler has an opportunity of refuting it."

Sir Henry Fowler, as the people of India learned to their cost, did not seize the opportunity. On the contrary, when he left the India Office he was, if possible, less of a Liberal than when he entered it. The question which is now being asked is whether, in any true sense, he can be called a Liberal at all. At the end of January, for the first time since the General Election, he addressed the Liberal Association in his constituency. We venture to think that the speech was, in some ways, the most remarkable of all the speeches which were delivered in the recess. For the lessons which Sir Henry Fowler

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

drew from the defeat and rout of the Liberal party last summer were :—

(i) That where the Government rests on a popular basis, you cannot legislate in advance of public opinion; and

(ii) That a system of Parliamentary groups is dangerous to party government.

Now, these propositions are, in themselves, not merely true, but truisms. They are akin to the proposition that two straight lines cannot enclose a space. But to deduce them as the lessons, and the sole lessons, of the Liberal defeat is, of course, to give away the Liberal case. The contention of Liberals was, we thought, not that Parliamentary groups or attempts to legislate in advance of public opinion compassed the downfall of the late Government, but that its strength was undermined by the cankering influence of a policy of obstruction in the House of Commons supplemented, and therefore encouraged, by a policy of destruction in the House of Lords. If Sir Henry Fowler is prepared to give away himself and his late colleagues in this reckless fashion, we cannot be surprised that, after a silence of six months' duration, he had not one word to say either about Lord George Hamilton's dealings with the cotton duties or about the retention of Chitral by the present Government.

"The Aims of the Congress."

"For the East India Association, which has somehow earned the reputation of allowing an official bias to govern its proceedings, to convene a meeting for a discussion upon the Indian National Congress is (writes a correspondent) an encouraging sign. A paper was read before a crowded meeting on February 17th by Mr. A. Nundy on the Origin, Aims and Objects of this organisation, the chair being taken by Sir Lepel Griffin. The retired Anglo-Indian element mustered pretty strong, amongst those present being Mr. Justice Pinhey, Messrs. H. Thornton C.S.I., J. B. Pennington, A. K. Connell, A. Rogers, J. Vaughan Morgan, J. Woodrow, C. V. Chapman; Drs. G. W. Leitner, C.I.E., H. R. Cook, G. Oswald; Surgeon Lieut-Colonel Ince, Lieut-Colonel Wintle, Rev. G. C. Reynall and others. Young India was represented by a large contingent. Sir Lepel Griffin in his introductory remarks cleared away two misapprehensions. The one was the commonly accepted belief that the East India Association would not allow a subject to be discussed which did not bear the stamp of official approval, and the other was the opinion, assiduously propagated by certain Anglo-Indian journals, that the Indian National Congress was mainly composed of disappointed men, and raw youths fresh from the Universities, before they settled down in life. The chairman gave it on his authority that 'any question in which a large part of the most educated and intelligent of the Indian people took interest came within the scope of the discussions of the Association.' Mr. Nundy in his paper first showed the utter falsity of the allegation that the educated classes were disloyal and disaffected. They recognised and appreciated the good that British rule had done in India by introducing for the first time greater security of life and property, pure administration of justice and immunity from foreign invasion, which alone demanded the gratitude of the people. If for no other reason than the selfish one that they were not prepared to govern the country themselves, they felt how impolitic it would be to weaken the Government which held together the heterogeneous masses. There were, no doubt, exhibitions of dissatisfaction and discontent, but for these British rule was solely responsible. On the one hand it had brought the people into contact with Western civilisation, granted them a liberal education, freedom of speech and a free press, while on the other hand it had refused to grant them a share in the administration of their country. To all thoughtful minds, Mr. Nundy contended, it was evident that the Government was not in touch with the people, who, on their side, owing to diversity of race, religion and habits, were unable to co-operate with each other for their common benefit. The National Congress was thus started, the object being to bring together all the conflicting elements, and to combine them in one harmonious whole, to act as the medium of communication between the Government and the people of India, and to consolidate the union between England and India by securing the introduction of such reforms as were desirable in the interests of the nation.

A Chorus of Approval.

"Mr. Nundy showed," our correspondent continues, "that these objects have to some extent been realised. Hindus, Christians, Parsis, Jains, and even some Muhammadans, are now heartily co-operating with each other, and the mass of the Muhammadans would, he contended, undoubtedly have joined but that they fell an easy prey to the policy formulated by some Anglo-Indian administrators of *divide et impera*, and thought that they could make capital out of the displeasure by which Hindus were then overshadowed. He denied that the demands of the Congress were extravagant or unreasonable and, taking up resolution after resolution approved by the Congress, showed that some of the demands had already been granted, though partially, while as regards others their reasonableness had been recognised by the Government, or by public opinion in India and in England. An animated discussion followed Mr. Nundy's paper. It had two distinguishing features. Some of the young Indians

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

present—aptly termed, by the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, the unorthodox supporters of the Congress—were strongly in favour of the adoption of a more assertive attitude towards England, without, however, hinting at the existence of any feelings of disloyalty, whilst the Europeans present displayed a general approval of the paper read by Mr. Nundy, who was warmly complimented and thanked, especially by the chairman, for the temperate and able manner in which he had dealt with facts that were interesting in themselves and of value in promoting the good government of the country. This absence of criticism on the part of the retired officials, who are naturally looked upon as experts, proved in a sense unfortunate. If they had spoken strongly no doubt the Jingo press would have given greater prominence to the subject."

THE JINGO REVIVAL.

By A. E. FLETCHER.
Editor of the "New Age."

The old Manchester school of politicians, notwithstanding their "devil-take-the-hindmost" theory of economics, rendered services to the cause of international peace and goodwill which ought not to be forgotten. It is deeply to be regretted that the stalwarts of that school have left no equally sane and eloquent successors to speak forth the words of truth and soberness at the present crisis when Jingoism is once more in the ascendant. Doubtless, if such men were in the House of Commons to-day, and took the same independent line that Cobden and Bright took not only against Toryism, but against official Liberalism in 1853 and again in 1857, they would incur the popular odium and the defeat which those great statesmen fearlessly risked, but they would exert an influence which would speedily smash the present Government in spite of its big majority. The jingo fever is fortunately not a lingering disease, and Lord Salisbury might be turned out of office next year if we had an opposition inspired by men of such high character and calm wisdom as they who led the Radicalism of the last generation to victory with the watchwords of "Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform." If Lord Salisbury's administration were to collapse next Session like a house of cards, the occurrence would not be unprecedented. Lord Palmerston was carried into office on a wave of "Rule Britannia" enthusiasm in 1857, when he secured one of the biggest majorities on record, yet his Government did not last for two Sessions. He was defeated in the House of Commons in 1858 by a majority of nineteen. Both Cobden and Bright were rejected at the General Election of 1857 which turned on the question of the iniquitous China War. That a vast majority of the electorate should have approved of Lord Palmerston's swaggering policy on this question is to me as great a mystery as that an attempt should now be made to promote the apotheosis of the persons chiefly responsible for the crimes recently committed in the interest of Stock Exchange gamblers by the Chartered Company's filibusters in South Africa. But, as Mr. Bright said at the time of the outbreak of the Crimean war, nations like individuals occasionally go mad. We can only charitably assume that it is some kind of national madness which approves of the recent proceedings of the Salisbury Government. When the country recovers its senses it will undoubtedly condemn the annexation of Chitral, the needless invasion of Ashanti, and the contemptible plot to annex the Transvaal. English "Society," which is simply another name for organised greed and gambling, seems for the moment to have hypnotised the democracy into an approval of the Government's "spirited" policy on colonial and foreign questions. A reaction, however, would soon come if we had men to lead and inspire us. It is perfectly evident that an attempt will be made to give the filibuster Jameson an ovation. The best we can say of this young man, who is the mere tool of Cecil Rhodes and Company, is that he may have been deluded into the belief that he was going to the relief of the wronged and the suffering. Nobody, however, who knows anything of the method of procedure of the Chartered Company will accept this assumption without a smile. No sane person can now believe that Dr. Jameson's employers acted out of pure philanthropy. The attempt of the Jingoes to create ill-feeling against the Boers because of their shyness in giving the franchise to the Outlanders is very amusing. Mr. Balfour, in his recent speech at Manchester, while mildly condemning the Jameson fiasco, was unable to conceal his sympathy with the organisers of the raid. Mr. Balfour took occasion to lecture President Kruger for failing to adopt in its integrity the good old constitutional doctrine that taxation and representation go together. Mr. Balfour is a leader of the party which has persistently opposed the adoption of that principle. Isn't it sheer hypocrisy for English statesmen to lecture the Boers for refusing to enfranchise the Outlanders (who are not the best company to be met with in this world) while our Parliament at home is not elected on the widest possible franchise, and while we refuse representative Government to the whole of our fellow-subjects in India? When we cease to hold down the Indian people by the throat, and make an honest attempt to give them some control over the enormous revenues which we raise from them, it will be time enough for us to advise

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

President Kruger to redress the grievances of the Johannesburghers.

We cannot expect, however, that anything will be done to allay the present jingo fever or to reverse the "forward" policy which the Government have been pursuing in Asia, Africa, and America until we get men in Parliament who will be able to rouse Liberalism from its lethargy. The Liberal party can never become an inspiring force again so long as it acquiesces in the wanton waste of needless millions upon armaments, or so long as it fails to protest against the madness of extending our military frontier and contracting our moral position. A Cobden or a Bright is much needed just now to brave both official and popular wrath in denouncing this costly folly. We want men who will dare to raise such a storm as these great apostles of political righteousness and peace raised forty years ago. Perhaps no two men ever made themselves more unpopular than Cobden and Bright did at the time when the nation's brain was turned at the prospect of a war with Russia. They were sneered at and jeered at by the classes, and publicly hooted and insulted by the masses. Priests tried to preach them down, and poets denounced them as cowards and traitors. When we remember that men of genius like Tennyson and Sidney Dobell caught the jingo fever in the middle of the century, we need hardly be surprised that our music-hall laureate should have been similarly afflicted at the end of it. But notwithstanding Alfred Tennyson's sneers about "the broad-brimmed hawker of holy things," and Sidney Dobell's charge that Cobden and Bright wanted to save the blood of their countrymen "to reserve it for their blushes," the line which these great leaders, with but few followers, took was the right one. After all, enthusiasm for righteousness is more permanently contagious than jingoism, and it was not long before Cobden and Bright were able to exercise an influence strong enough to upset the jingoes of the fifties, and bring back the nation to the condition of the man clothed and in his right mind. Would that politicians of the stamp of these mighty prophets of peace and goodwill were amongst us to-day.

THE INDIAN OUTLANDER.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

The Uitlander of the Transvaal, persistently befooled and put off by the carefully self-regarding Government of the Boers, has at last had serious attention drawn to his grievances. The list of these, Mr. Chamberlain acknowledges, is "formidable in length and serious in quality." The Uitlander is many times as numerous as the Boer. Yet he cannot obtain naturalisation and the franchise except on conditions so onerous as to amount to practical denial. He cannot get efficient education for his children in the State or State-aided schools. He suffers gross extortion in taxes and tariff; and his industry is crippled not only by imposts but by absurdly restrictive conditions. The finances are mismanaged; the expenditure escapes proper control and audit; the taxation is beyond administrative needs; unfair discrimination is shown in the collection of personal taxes; the import duties on the necessaries of life are at once a hardship on the working class, and a clog, frequently prohibitive, on industrial development. Exceptional legal restrictions are placed upon the right of public meeting. He is crushed by monopolies as regards mining requisites and other important articles of commerce. He suffers from vexatious formalities and needless restrictions, as well as the absence of needful restrictions, in respect of mining labour. The railways are managed, in regard to personal and traffic arrangements, not in the general interest of the community, but for the financial advantage of the Government. The Uitlander is excluded from the police force by burgher prejudice, although the burgher population "cannot possibly be expected to furnish adequate material from which to select candidates for this department of the public service." A list of formidable length and gravity, no doubt. Mr. Chamberlain proposes for the Rand the remedy of Home Rule.

Other remedy there is none, consistently with the continued predominance of the Boers in the Transvaal. The Irish will not be deterred by Mr. Balfour's incidental distinctions from enforcing the argument in its application to Ireland. And what of India? Is there not an Outlander question of much gravity simmering and menacing in India? Why, the Indian populations are all Outlanders in their own country! The list of their grievances, if drawn up with equal frankness by Lord George Hamilton, would be seen to be no less "formidable in length and serious in quality" than Mr. Chamberlain's Uitlander list. We took India by the sword—the sword of our adventurous Dr. Jamesons—and by other means of less honourable quality than even the sword; and we stuck to our takings, and have not scrupled to extend them with ingenious industry. True, the sword is now theoretically rusting in the scabbard, and men in high places talk impressively of trusteeship, moral influence, and even religious responsibility. They turn up the whites of their eyes, like President Krüger. Like President Krüger, they conclude with a *non possumus* to urgent demands of reasonable rights. It is to be earnestly hoped that the further parallel may induce some more practical regard for the just rights of this Outlander population in their own land.

Just let us see how the facts stand on a few of the points. Take the question of representation. Well, there is the India Councils Act of 1892. That Act, no doubt, was something to be thankful for, with all its imperfections. It provided, in a way, that the voice of the country should have an opportunity of making itself heard in the Legislative Councils. But the method of election is an indirect

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

method, very obnoxious to Englishmen when applied in their own affairs. The representative delegates are elected, not by the people directly, but indirectly by their elected representatives for other purposes; and it is no wonder that the method creates great and general dissatisfaction. Besides, the right even of this indirect election is arbitrarily given and withheld. It was the only other day that Lord Sandhurst sensibly redressed the grievance of exclusion under which the very important central division of Bombay, including Poona and Satara, rested under the *régime* of Lord Harris. In the North-West Provinces and Oudh, the forty-four District Boards are grouped in two groups, each group having the right to send one member, while only 10 out of the 103 municipalities are judged fit to be entrusted with the privilege. The Punjab actually has no legislative council at all, nor yet the right of sending a representative to the Viceroy's Council. Why? "Is it," asked Bakshi Jaishi Ram, at the Madras meeting of the National Congress, with justifiable bitterness, "Is it because the people of the Punjab shed their blood in 1859 against their own people, and secured the glory of the British Crown by fighting in the fields of Abyssinia or other foreign countries? Or is it because for the present the fighting tribes are supplied in great measure from the Punjab? Or is it because the frontier crisis is some day to be decided by the people of the Punjab?" Mr. Gladstone looked forward to a very different result—"not merely to a nominal, but to a real living representation of the people." Lord Salisbury, on the other side, said: "If we are to do it, and if it has to be done, of course accepting that it must be done, let us do it systematically, taking care that the machinery provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation, not to accidentally constituted bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India?" Yet the official framers of the rules under the Act have thwarted the intentions of Parliament and of the leaders of the two great parties with an efficiency all but parallel to the procrastination of President Krüger.

Take again the case of education, and follow it out to the practical results. Early in the century, the decision was finally taken to educate the people, and one can only regard with amazement the actual dubiety of the governing class on the subject. It is only recently, however, that anything has been done towards the establishment of places of technical education, while the literary education in all the grades leaves enormous scope for expansion. The Universities are mere shells. Industrial colleges—there are none in Calcutta or in Madras, and the one in Bombay is languishing for sheer lack of funds. Mr. Master, speaking before the National Congress at Madras in 1894, with full technical knowledge and with experience of the country, did not hesitate to say this: "With all the raw material at our very door, with all the evidence of skill the Indians have shown in arts and manufacture, the sight of the country depending upon other countries for almost all manufactured articles is to me, I say, somewhat dreadful." The cry of the intelligent people is for a steady and efficient expansion of education in every form, in order to bring them mentally abreast of other nations, and to enable them to develop successfully the industrial resources of the land. The Government, to which it is inevitable that they should turn their eyes, no doubt potters over the business in a well-intentioned fashion; but it is impossible to acknowledge that the people receive in this respect anything like such satisfaction of their wants as they are justly entitled to expect. Such spread of education as has already been attained is not fairly allowed to have its proper recognition in the administrative departments of Government. The Simultaneous Examinations fiasco shows a deliberate official contempt of the natural expectations raised by the Queen's Proclamation and confirmed by the progress of intelligence among the people. Sir Thomas Munro, we are told by Sir A. J. Arbuthnot, "attached little value to schemes for improving the education of the natives, unless *pari passu*, steps were taken for extending to them a greater share in the honours and endowments of office." Munro was wiser than most of his successors, foreseeing that education must inevitably find a practical issue in the government and administration of the country, else it would inevitably lead to troublesome, and to dangerous, discontent. There will, in fact, be no real satisfaction until our governing officials see eye to eye with Sir Charles Napier. "We must mix with the people," said Sir Charles Napier, "give them justice, give them riches, give them honours, give them share in all things, until we blend with them and become one nation. When a half-caste or a full native can be Governor-General, we shall not hold India as a colony or conquest, but be part inhabitants, and as numerous as will be required to hold it as our own." The rising Salar Jungs, Dinkur Raos, Madhava Raos, and the rest, must be permitted as free a career under the Government of India as in the Native States. The extravagant reluctance of officialism to recognise irreversible facts can only work mischief. For, as Mr. James Routledge well put it, "we have opened to India a new door, a new life of knowledge, and the strongest arms in the world never again can close the door."

It is needless, after recent discussions, to do more than refer to the crushing weight of expenditure, not merely as against revenue, but in regard to the true development of the energies of the country. Nor need the over-riding of the opinion of India on such matters as the cotton duties be agitated anew. If India had been allowed to act for herself, she would not for a moment have allowed her infant textile industry to be crippled in favour of the cotton magnates of Lancashire. If native statesmen had any influence in the councils of the nation, can it be believed for an instant that they would squander lakhs and crores of rupees on a barren frontier that can well defend itself, while more than fifty millions of the population habitually drag out a wretched existence on the verge of starvation? If we look at the judicial service, we shall find grievances in plenty clamorous for reform—a reform that must await the pleasure of an officialdom interested to avert any change—a reform of evils that have been frankly

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

admitted by Liberal and Conservative Secretaries of State, that are removable without fresh expense, and that nevertheless remain in vigorous operation. Let these indications suffice. In spite of all distinctions that may be drawn between the Transvaal Uitlander and the Indian Outlander, there unhappily remain only too many and too serious points of substantial community. The essential considerations that weigh with Mr. Chamberlain in his suggestions for the mitigation of the Johannesburg difficulty ought to weigh much more heavily with Lord George Hamilton. There is no demand that everything should be done with a rush. But it concerns both India and England very materially that reasonable requirements of reform should be promptly and fairly considered, and be met with reasonable and timely concessions. Thereby we should save a vast amount of futile waste, and strengthen the position at all points, were it only by the elimination of weakening and rankling elements.

THE SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS IN INDIA.

BY A. NUNDY.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, in the valuable statement which was published in "INDIA" for December has furnished a very fair idea of the evils which beset the combination in one person of Executive and Judicial functions. Mr. Ghose professes to speak only for the Bengal Presidency. Now, for a variety of reasons Bengal contrasts most favourably with other provinces. It enjoys a great many advantages which are denied to some of the other provinces. The Permanent Settlement, Trial by Jury, superior education, and the existence of a public opinion, though not in a very pronounced form, constitute safeguards which are utterly wanting in some of the other provinces, whereas there is an absence of some of the inducements and some of the opportunities which lend themselves in other provinces (such as the North-Western Provinces and the Central Provinces, of both of which I have personal experience) to officers exercising executive functions to interfere with the due administration of justice. In the Central Provinces, which is still what is called a non-regulation province, as also are Oudh, the Punjab, Assam, and the Berars, the district officer is invested with much larger judicial powers than in the regulation provinces. He has the power of inflicting a fine to any extent, and of sentencing the accused to an imprisonment not exceeding seven years. It will be seen how immense these powers are, and what unlimited scope an officer possessing such powers has of abusing his functions if he wishes to do so. But it is not the district officer alone who is likely to, or does as a matter of fact, abuse his position. The combination of these two functions leads men holding very feeble authority indeed to show that they can exercise that little authority to the detriment of others. The *tehseldar* (revenue collector), the lowest revenue officer, who also exercises judicial fuctions as a magistrate, can just as much become an engine of oppression as a more highly placed official.

In the greater part of Bengal the Permanent Settlement prevails. If the annual revenue to which the Government is entitled is not duly paid by a zemindar, the property, after the requisite notice, is put up for sale. The law does not permit, and the officials do not show, any consideration. The zemindar has full knowledge of the consequences of his becoming a defaulter. No favour is asked, for none can be given. No coercion is used, for none is necessary. But in the provinces where periodical settlements prevail, matters are very different. The revenue may be remitted in part, or its payment delayed at the will of the collector. Ordinarily, however, this officer has to collect all the revenue he can—in fact, his success as an official depends on the proportion of the total land revenue of the district he is able to send in to the Government treasury. As to his efficiency as a judicial officer, I do not think the Government gives it a thought when it makes the selection of an officer to take charge of the district. The revenue must be collected somehow. The *tehseldar* exercises all his ingenuity to get the hundreds of the zemindars in his *tahseel* to pay in the revenue, and if, in the course of so doing, he or his subordinates exercise a little coercion or a little intimidation, who is to question him or call him to account? He knows he has complete immunity for what he does whilst he is discharging this, the most important, part of his function. Any complaints to his superior officer will simply be thrown into the waste-paper basket, or, if the zemindar has the temerity to lodge a complaint in any of the criminal courts, it will have to be heard by officers who are themselves exercising this dual function, and are all subordinate to the district magistrate, who is, at the same time, the collector of the district. In the course of the twenty years during which I have been practicing at the Bar I have on several occasions been consulted by men who have suffered indignities or been maltreated by the revenue officials. My advice to them has always been to sit quiet and forget what has transpired, for I felt sure that anyone resorting to legal proceedings in a matter of this kind would be a marked man, and would have eventually to suffer for his temerity. It would have been otherwise, if these complaints could be heard by a tribunal exercising judicial functions only, and not subordinate to the district magistrate. The cases could have been tried on their merits and the appeal heard by the district judges, who, I must admit, do not allow themselves to be influenced by extraneous considerations, but confine themselves to merely adjudicating upon the question whether the conviction is borne out by the evidence or not.

But it is not only in the collection of the revenue that breaches of the law are committed, whilst the prospect of obtaining relief is but small. The district magistrate is responsible for the peace of the district. In his executive capacity he often receives information that a certain person is likely to disturb the peace—information which is one-sided, is often based on calumny, or supported by police officers who may be misinformed, or may have some object in getting the person concerned into trouble. He calls upon this person to show cause why he should not be bound over to keep the peace. He has then

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

two alternatives before him: either to try the case himself or to send it for trial to a subordinate magistrate. If he takes the case on his own file, and, in his judicial capacity, records evidence in the case on which alone he is supposed to decide it, how can he help being biassed? How can he divest himself from all previously received impressions, and from the information which led him to form an opinion that it was proper to institute proceedings against this man? Thus with the best intentions he may err, and cause a miscarriage of justice. It is not he that is to blame, so much as the system of which he himself is the victim. But the other alternative, to my mind, is by far the worse so far as the supposed offender is concerned. The case is sent for trial to a subordinate magistrate, who proceeds to hold a judicial inquiry. He is by no means a free agent. He has not merely to decide the case upon the evidence adduced before him, for other considerations creep in. Ought he to dismiss a case which has been sent over to him by the district magistrate, who must, he thinks, have good reason for desiring the man to be bound over? What if by dismissing the case he were to incur the displeasure of his official superior, on whom alone his chances of promotion depend? Then, again, in cases of this kind the district magistrate is the Appellate Court. What, the subordinate magistrate thinks to himself, will be the result if the matter is brought before the Appellate Court? An appeal from a conviction, he with good reason surmises, would be hopeless, whilst in case of an acquittal the district magistrate may, either at his own instance or at the instance of the other party, commence proceedings in revision, and cancel the order and send the case for trial to another magistrate. The safest and easiest way out of his difficulty is for him to convict. Such cases are by no means uncommon. I once appeared in a case where two brothers were called upon to show cause why they should not be bound over to keep the peace towards each other. The district magistrate at first issued an informal notice to them in his executive capacity. He heard both sides, and eventually decided that my client was to be proceeded against. I frankly admit that I would much rather that he had heard the case out himself; but he sent it to a subordinate magistrate, who, in utter disregard of all the evidence produced before him, which went to show that not my client, but his brother, was the aggressor, bound him over in a heavy sum to keep the peace.

I may here allude to what has been my experience, and is the experience of other barristers and pleaders, that in certain instances we would much prefer a case to be heard by a European rather than by an Indian magistrate. An Indian magistrate, unless he is a Covenanted Civilian, cannot help being swayed by the views of a district magistrate. He cannot completely dismiss from his mind what might be the consequences to him if he were to act contrary to the wishes or inclination of his superior officer. I have frequently applied under instructions from my client that a particular case be sent for trial to a European magistrate, and often with the full consent, and sometimes even at the instigation of the Indian magistrate to whom it would otherwise have been sent. An amusing instance of how a European magistrate was above being influenced by the views of his official superior occurred in my own experience in the Central Provinces. A case was sent by the district magistrate to a subordinate European magistrate with the remark, not demi-official, but on the back of the police *chalan* "I hope the magistrate will inflict the severest sentence he can," which meant in this case two years' imprisonment and 1,000 rupees fine. The case was heard by this magistrate and, as the evidence for the prosecution had absolutely broken down, I duly informed my client he was sure of an acquittal. To my surprise the magistrate read out a judgment convicting the accused and as a climax inflicted on him a fine of eight annas; The magistrate afterwards told me: "You know that your client is an old offender, and doesn't care a rap for his character for he has none" (which was the truth), "I could have acquitted him but I wished to show the district magistrate he had no business to dictate to me what sentence to pass in a case. I, therefore, convicted your client and sentenced him to a merely nominal punishment."

It is a very suggestive fact that we never hear any complaints of any outside influence being brought to bear on the subordinate judges of the Civil Courts. The reason is obvious. The district judges never interfere with the subordinate courts in the discharge of their duties. They are not even aware what cases have been instituted or are being heard by these courts. Sometimes it happens that a district judge sends for a judge subordinate, but it is always to enquire from him something with reference to a case which had already been decided by him and which was then pending in the appellate court. Even this practice is growing rare. The subordinate magistrates are, however, differently circumstanced. They are frequently called up by the district magistrate, who talks to them, and advises them on cases pending before them, and sometimes even dictates to them what sentence to pass. In a case in which I appeared for the defence the magistrate whilst trying it practically admitted that only a technical offence had been committed, but, much to my surprise, he inflicted on my client a sentence of imprisonment. He advisedly made it, however, long enough to be appealable to the district judge. He afterwards admitted to me that, if left to himself, he would have imposed a mere nominal fine, but that he was prevailed upon by the district magistrate to pass a sentence of imprisonment. The sessions judge, on appeal, acquitted the man altogether. The relative positions of the subordinate judges and of the deputy magistrates will be apparent from the fact that for anything improper done by the former the district judges send a report against them not to the Local Government but to the High Court, whereas the district magistrate in his executive capacity reports his subordinates to the Local Government. How, then, is it possible that these magistrates can conscientiously discharge their duties when their fate is entirely in the hands of the executive officers? Place them on the same footing as subordinate judges, and I have no doubt their work will be equally commendable with that of their brethren in the civil department.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Again, these magistrates have not only to please the district magistrate, but also the police officers who conduct the prosecution in all cases sent up by them. Go to the court of any deputy-magistrate in the North-Western Provinces and you will see barristers and pleaders outside the Bar conducting their cases, whilst on the bench the police officer, often only a sub-inspector, is seated by the side of the presiding magistrate and whispering to him, or coaching him, as to what he is to do. Often before the case is called up, the police officer has been closeted with the magistrate, who sometimes very innocently discloses the fact that he has a more extensive knowledge of the case than could have been obtained from the proceedings recorded by him in open court. In Bengal these practices may be rare, but in the North-Western Provinces they are so common that they excite no comment. That such practices are neither legal nor necessary is evident from the fact that in trials before the Sessions Court they are not resorted to, nor would they for a moment be tolerated. The deputy-magistrates are helpless in the matter, for if they ignored the police officers, these would at once complain to the district superintendents of police, who would report the matter to the district magistrate, who in his turn would soon call these magistrates to account. Superintendents of police have not hesitated to send up a report against district judges, when these officers have found themselves obliged to order an acquittal in a large number of cases, which is of course looked upon as a great reflection on the police work.

The combination of Executive and Judicial functions is a great blot in the government of India by England. In the interests of the people, in the interests of the magistrates, and in the interests of government itself, the sooner these functions are separated the better it will be for all concerned.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S DRAFTS.

HOW SHOULD THEY BE SOLD?

This question is one that at first sight relates to the technicalities of exchange, and to ways that are peculiar to the money market. Hence the "experts" in those regions claim to answer the question in the only way that suits their customs, class prejudices, and monetary interest. What is more, those potent persons whose pecuniary purposes are primarily served by the present plan whereby the Council bills are, in effect, sold to the lowest bidders, appear to have constrained the financial authorities of the India Office to accept their method of conducting these enormous weekly transactions. Those authorities, we may be quite sure, are anxious in the interest of India to get the best price for the drafts; and seeing that they have for long accepted the dictum of the money market in this vital matter of current finance, we must suppose that they have been convinced against their will. It would, therefore, be presumption on our part to hope that we could show them a more excellent way of selling he ir orders for silver (new token rupees) in the n dian Treasuries. At best we can only raise the question; but in doing so there is both motive and influential precedent in excuse of our temerity. First as to motive—saving or gain on behalf of the Indian taxpayer. If but one halfpenny more could be obtained for each of the six millions of rupees that are now being weekly sold by the Secretary of State through the money market, that would be a gain of £12,500 at this end, representing a saving of nearly a lakh and a half in India. As to precedent, we can claim the intention and expressed desire of the last Indian Secretary to devise some method by which the India Office could take its right position as the master, instead of the slave of the money market. These are the remarks on the subject made by Sir Henry Fowler, in his speech on the Indian Budget:—

"A matter about which I was very much exercised when I was in office was the mode in which these bills are sold. I was not satisfied that the Indian Government got the full market price for what they had to sell. The Secretary of State is the only seller of the commodity, and there is only a limited number of buyers; and, whether right or wrong, I arrived at the conclusion that the buyers had a good deal to do with fixing the price which was offered. Had I been in office, I should have devoted a considerable amount of further attention to the question, with a view to ascertaining whether some better mode of selling bills could not be devised. I know that the question is beset with difficulties, and possibly in the first instance it may be advisable to appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the question."

Since these remarks were made the anomaly has been accentuated which had very reasonably puzzled Sir Henry on the business side of his mind—namely, the apparent enormous excess of demand over the supply of these bills offered. About the time when these brief Budget debates took place (August and September) there were instances of an aggregate of tenders exceeding by four, five, or six times the amount of bills offered. And, under the date Wednesday, 5th (two weeks before these remarks are written), we find in the City articles such lines as this: "Silver firm at 30⅞d., the market being stiffened by the large application for India Council drafts this afternoon, which were again on a 'record' scale"—that is, for the sixty lakhs of bills offered by the India Office there were applications tendered to the amount of 622½ lakhs—that is, more than ten times (apparent) demand for the (visible) supply. And, as indicated above, in the week previous there had been a similar demand, out of all proportion to the supply offered.

In the case of any other commodity or security one would expect the demand quickly to adjust itself to the restricted supply by some sharp and appreciable addition to price. But, somehow, this does not happen in the case of the Secretary of State's orders on the Indian Treasuries for disbursement of rupees.

Even the City editors themselves expect that the normal effect—increased price causing check in demand—will follow on this apparent eager competition. For we note on these occasions such remarks as these: "The silver market was firm, owing to the larger applications for India Council drafts;" "The allotment of Council drafts was again favourable and the silver market strengthened under its influence;" and so on. Be it noted, in passing, that it is

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

silver that goes up as the effect "that is seen" at the time of these rushes for the Secretary of State's drafts, *not* appreciably the price of the drafts themselves. Yet there is also a certain fractional gain to the India Office Treasury, which may be traced in the smaller amount of tenders that secure the minimum rate (fixed beforehand) and the larger portion of tenders, that "receive in full" at such extra prices as the India Office, with its slavish dread of "the City," ventures to claim under favour of the rush for bills. But this extra price is very small. It may be traced in the rates at which "special sales" of bills are made after the total amount offered has been disposed of. Thus, in that week of tenfold demand, the "special sales" were only at $\frac{1}{16}$d. more than the ruck. It should be mentioned here that the other mode of adjustment, increase in supply, is timidly tried by the India Office; that it is since September that sixty lakhs per week have been offered instead of fifty. Here we may be reminded that we are venturing too much into technical details; but less would not serve, even if this suffices, to explain to the general reader the inside of this habitually obscured subject.

Now we will greatly dare in proceeding to set out what appear to us the principles and essential conditions that define and control the scope and financial results of these enormous monetary transactions (a more constant quantity than any other in the money market), by which the "tribute" of our Indian empire is brought into the aggregate income of the United Kingdom. This shall be done in the concisest form practicable—though even so at the risk of some repetition.

1. The Secretary of State for India is the largest and only *constant* seller of silver in the world—this position being somewhat modified whilst the Indian mints remain closed, the rupee being thereby made a token coin, though still legal tender in India.

2. Thus he can always affect, indeed control, the supply of the white metal at a price limited, upwards, only by the alternative of remitters to the East sending out bar silver. This margin is not a wide one; but it is also specialized by the fact that he alone has always silver ready to be delivered in India (see Mr. Goschen's Silver Committee Report, 1876, etc., etc.).

3. Here the Indian Secretary can each week fix the minimum *price* he will sell at; and he need not, as now, announce beforehand the *amount* he will sell—he can limit that at his own discretion as one means of setting the price of his own drafts or of silver.

4. But it is the interest of the City—primarily of the Anglo-Indian banks and East India merchants—to secure the India Office drafts at the lowest rate they can get them: thus their class interest (including that of the brokers) makes it possible for the buyers to maintain an understanding not to offer more than a certain minimum price each week.

5. For years past (with certain brief and ill-timed exceptions) it has seemed that the India Office weakly defers to the City interest, virtually placing itself at the mercy of that interest—thereby, in effect, selling its bills by "Dutch auction," that is, to the lowest bidders.

6. The consideration on which that class and market interest chiefly relies is the assumption that the Secretary of State *must* sell his bills; and in the long run that is so.

7. But there is this important difference in the position of the two parties: the buyers (bankers and merchants) must remit at the *precise dates* when their obligations fall due—apart from any margin for speculation at uncertain times, evidence of which motive is shown by the frequent instances of five, eight, or even ten times the amount offered by the India Office being applied for. But the Secretary of State is not so bound to special dates or even seasons; he is always backed by a considerable (often too large) cash balance at the Bank of England, which should enable him to exercise his own option and reserve both as to price and amount from one week, or even one month, to another—allowing, of course (as in para. 2), for trade price and supply of silver.

8. There is also the reserve resource of borrowing in sterling (several times resorted to in recent years): this at once saves for the time a large sum in "cost of exchange": (as to this course, its scope and permanent influence on Indian finance, see Part 1, Vol. XV., East India Association's *Journal*, 1883, etc., etc.).

As Sir Henry Fowler is now enjoying a position of less responsibility and greater freedom than at the time he briefly raised this large question in practical financial management, we venture, with deference, to offer him the above as a basis of material on which to work it out. For our part, we make little doubt that such a solution could be found as would result in a saving to India of many lakhs, if not a crore or two in the year.

W. M. W.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL REFORM IN INDIA.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

Recent events in India have revived a taunt that was levelled against the Indian National Congress in the earlier days of its existence—that its supporters devote their energies exclusively to political emancipation, that they are dead to the sentiments of justice and compassion which would prompt them to mitigate the hardships of women, and that they are indisposed to change or relax any of those customs and observances of private life which are detrimental to their own interests and happiness, and would not for a moment be tolerated by the least civilised nation in the West. It is now asserted that so long as the adherents of the Congress allowed the Social Conference the use of their pavilion, they had some ground for pleading that they ware not opposed to social reform; but that they have now thrown off the veil, and stand revealed in their true colours as uncompromising enemies of such reform.

If the rank and file of the Congress were really, as a body, opposed to social progress, that movement would undoubtedly be discredited, and would with good reason lose the sympathies, not only of a good many Englishmen, but also of many Indians who are

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

among its strongeat supporters. The attitude taken up by the critics of the Congress in this sense is to all appearances logical enough. Say they to the political reformers: "You have deliberately abstained from discussing questions which affect the social or moral welfare of millions in India, and now, as you have declined to lend the use of your hall to those interested in such matters, you cannot with decency pretend that you are not opposed to them." Undoubtedly a deplorable state of affairs, if true. But is there any foundation for this charge?

I need hardly say that as a Christian, and as one who, in his several visits to England, has spent many years in that country, and has naturally imbibed many ideas which regulate social and family life in the West, I am strongly of opinion that there is as urgent a need of reform in social matters in India as there is in political matters. My sympathy is enlisted equally in support of the social reformer and of the political reformer. To my mind both are the direct outcome of British rule in India. Both have received the same education and training, both have been brought into contact with Western civilisation, and both are desirous of emancipating themselves from the thraldom to which they are subjected, in the one case by the strong grip of a foreign power, in the other case by the equally strong grasp of time-honoured rules and customs, regarded by some as part of the religious system of their country. The result of education has been to stimulate among its recipients a general desire for progress. Some have developed into active political reformers, others into social reformers, and others, again, are equally earnest and active in both causes. Yet whereas the the majority of political reformers in India, if not all of them, are from the force of circumstances social reformers as well, sometimes even though they be unconscious of the fact, and may even strenuously deny it, the social reformers may be absolutely wanting in any interest in political reforms. How an educated man can possibly say he is an opponent of social reform is to me incomprehensible. He is in his daily life unceasingly engaged in breaking down the barriers that hem him in on all sides, and prevent him, and those in whom he is interested, from extricating themselves from the influence of customs and practices that are now considered obnoxious or inconvenient or unnecessary. If he were to say, "I object to this or that particular reform being carried out," I would accept his statement; but not if he asserted that in his mode of living, in his relations with other men and with the members of his family, he was rigidly following the footsteps of his forefathers, and carrying out strictly the injunctions of his religion. Some there are in remote villages in the interior of the country, where English education and Western civilisation have not penetrated, who might truthfully assert this; but in the cities and towns the so-called orthodox Hindu is constantly committing breaches of law and custom which would have horrified his ancestors, and put him, not very long ago, beyond the pale of Hinduism. I do not allude to such acts and omissions on his part as have been rendered criminal by the existing law of the land, but to such acts and omissions as are entirely under his control, and in respect of which he need not allow himself to be influenced by extraneous opinion. A Brahman professor of law lectures on Hindu law to a class of students the majority of whom are Sudras, and a Brahman priest goes to the house of Sudras to expound the sacred scriptures. But what says Manu, the highest authority as to the interpretation of these scriptures?—

"For he who tells him the law and he who enjoins upon him (religious) observances, he indeed, together with that (Sudra) sinks into the darkness of the hell called Asamurtta (unbounded)."

A Brahman pleader appears in court for a few rupees to defend a low-caste man on a charge of having assaulted one belonging to the twice-born castes, conveniently forgetting that:—

"If a man of one birth assault one of the twice-born castes, even with virulent words, he ought to have his tongue cut out, for he is of the lowest origin."

Or perhaps he prosecutes a Brahman for stealing the goods of a Sudra, ignoring the text:—

"Whatever exists in the universe is all the property of the Brahman. A Brahman may take possession of the goods of a Sudra with perfect peace of mind, for, since nothing at all belongs to this (Sudra) as his own, he is one whose property may be taken away by his master."

A man of high caste, if he is consistent, should not allow even the shadow of a *Maleech* (outcast) to fall upon him. Yet he now travels complacently in a railway train rubbing shoulders with the lowest pariah, whose very touch is pollution. The really orthodox Hindu refuses to allow the well from which he draws water to be polluted by low castes. The political reformer rushes to the first pump and draws the water, or gets his servants to do it for him, utterly regardless of the fact that a moment before a *chamar* or a sweeper had done the same.

It is needless to multiply instances to prove how commonly so-called orthodox persons infringe caste rules and regulations to suit their own convenience. But the case may be carried further. Are there not many who quietly, yet deliberately, proceed to ignore the ordinances of their own religion to satisfy their appetites? Are there no Hindus in the full enjoyment of their caste privileges who systematically eat forbidden food and drink alcoholic drinks, and this often in the company of men whose touch should be pollution to them? It might be replied that there are some who do so, but that there are a great many others who do not—who strictly eschew anything that is forbidden. This is undoubtedly true; but, judged according to their own canons, they are not less guilty, for they eat, drink, and associate with fellow-caste people, or members of their own family who have committed serious infractions of caste rules, and who would undoubtedly have been put out of caste a few years ago. Can the political reformer deny that, according to the opinion generally prevailing amongst Hindus in India, for a man to cross the ocean (the "black water") is a sin which entails the penalty of being outcasted? Yet, at the sixth meeting of the National Congress, held at Calcutta, delegate after delegate, all belonging to the orthodox community, came forward, each on behalf of his province, and supported the motion for holding a Congress in London in the year 1892. And how is it that within recent years young men

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

who have visited England do not have meted out to them the penalty of being outcasted by some of the Hindu communities, though but a short time back they would not have received this consideration? It is not that they are re-admitted into caste, which would imply that they had had to undergo the humiliating ceremony of doing *praschit* (penance), but they are treated as if they had never lost caste, and are allowed all the privileges of the community to which they belong. Many more would undoubtedly receive this consideration, but that they become somewhat Anglicised in their habits, and are not disposed, even for the sake of keeping up appearances, to conform to the social customs of the family. Again, many associations have come into existence, each composed of the members of its own caste, and having for its object the correction of abuses which have crept into their community. Thus we have the Kayastha Conference, the Vaeshya Conference, and the Vaisnava Conference, besides minor societies which are more local in their operations. The members of these conferences and societies are undoubtedly recruited chiefly from the educated classes. Among the subjects they take up for discussion may be found female education, the raising of the minimum age of marriage, reduction of unnecessary expenditure at marriages and funerals, total abstinence, the discouragement of the employment of women of questionable character to sing on festive occasions, and generally the introduction and promotion of such measures as would tend to elevate the community.

It would, therefore, be idle on the part of any educated Indian to assert that he is opposed to social reform. His own daily life would contradict him. He may in some cases say that he is helpless—that unless he allowed himself to drift with the tide, he would be wrecked; but that if he had his own way, he would not have sanctioned any departure from the customs of his forefathers. A little consideration will convince him that it is absurd for him to assume a virtuous air and condemn his associates if they try to correct abuses and introduce reforms from which he himself profits. The number of such men is but few. But a few can sometimes do much mischief. The social customs of the Hindus are intimately connected with their religion. Any attempt to change them is only too readily construed into an attack upon their religion. Thus, at Poona, it was a few irreconcilables who, alleging that the social reformers had serious designs against the religious institutions of the Hindus, obtained the support of a goodly number of the less educated members of their community, and vehemently protested against the Congress allowing the use of its pavilion to the Social Conference. But was the main body of the National Congress in sympathy with them? Decidedly not. Mr. Justice Ranade addressed a circular letter to the various Standing Congress Committees asking their opinion on the question of the loan of the Congress pandal to the Conference, and, as he stated in his inaugural address:—

"There were 28 replies favourable to the Conference, *plus* 4 which are indifferent, or advise reference to the Congress—in all 32. There are besides 17 unfavourable, but of that number 10 are in full sympathy with Conference work, but advise concession this year to the Poona opposition, and there are only 7 replies which seem to be opposed. The proportion of favourable to unfavourable is thus nearly 2 to 1, and including those who advise concession for this year only, the proportion is as 6 to 1."

It is evident therefore that if the matter had been referred to the body of delegates assembled at the last Congress, their decision would have been in favour of the social reformers. Mr. Justice Ranade, however, removed all possible difficulty by abstaining from asking for the use of the hall. To an outside observer it seems clear that the Social Conference has gained considerably by this incident. It has succeeded in advertising itself more than it could possibly have done if it had pursued its usual course. That it is making its power and influence felt may be presumed from the fact that it has at last been thought desirable in some quarters to adopt an attitude of active hostility towards it. In future it will have to be reckoned with as a factor which cannot be ignored. The National Congress cannot possibly suffer from an incident which was purely local in its inception and operation. The main body of delegates are not and cannot be opposed to social reform and there is no reason to suppose that in Calcutta and elsewhere the social reformers will not receive the welcome hitherto accorded to them. The *Hindu*, the most orthodox journal of that community, has very clearly expressed this view. It says:—

"The Social Conference is as much under the guidance of educated Hindus as the political Congress, and in fact a large number of men are directly associated with both. How then the Congress or the educated Indians as a class can be said to be opposed to social reform we do not understand. We may regret the illiberal and unpatriotic attitude of individuals, but that cannot be mistaken for the attitude of the whole community."

Stronger testimony than this could not possibly be obtained. It is time therefore that the critics of the Congress refrained from directing their shafts against it on the ground that it has deliberately decided to exclude from its own meetings discussion upon social questions. The reasons which led it to take this course were admirably expressed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in his Presidential address at the second Congress:—

"How," he asked, "can this gathering of all classes discuss the social reforms needed in each individual class? What do any of us know of the internal home life, of the traditions, customs, feelings, prejudices, of any class but his own? How could a cosmopolitan gathering like this discuss to any purpose the reforms needed in any one class? Only the members of that class can effectively deal with the reforms therein needed. A National Congress must confine itself to questions in which the entire nation has a direct participation, and it must leave the adjustment of social reforms and other class questions to class congresses. But it does not follow because this national political body, as such, does not presume to discuss social reforms that the delegates here present are not just as deeply—nay, in many cases, far more deeply—interested in those questions than in those political questions which we *do* discuss, or that those several communities which these delegates represent are not doing their utmost to solve those complicated problems on which hinges the practical introduction of those reforms. Any man who has eyes and ears open must know what struggles towards higher and better things are going on in every community. And it could not be otherwise with the noble education we are receiving. Once you begin to think about your own actions, your duties and responsibilities to yourself, your neighbour, and your nation, you cannot avoid

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

looking round and discerning much that is wrong amongst you. And we know as a fact that each community is now doing its best according to its lights, and the progress that it has made in education. The Muhammadans know how much is being done by persons of their community to push on the education their brethren so much need; the Hindus are everywhere doing what they can to reform those social institutions which they think require improvement. There is not a single community here represented of which the best and ablest men do not feel that much has to be done to improve the social, moral, and religious status of their brethren, and in which, as a fact, they are not striving to effect gradually those needful improvements; but these are essentially matters too delicate for a stranger's handling—matters which must be left to the guidance of those who alone fully understand them in all their bearings, and which are wholly unsuited to discussion in an assemblage like this, in which men of all classes, creeds, and castes are intermingled."

Correspondence.

THE CONGRESS AND THE ANGLO-INDIAN PRESS.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—The Eleventh Congress, as evidence of the vitality and growing popularity of the movement, leaves little to be desired. If it has been as productive of hostile criticism it has also been as great a success as any of its predecessors—a fact little relished, if fully realised, by the Anglo-Indian press. The criticism emanating from that reputable quarter might, perhaps, be properly appreciated if it were less captious and more constructive. In relation to the Congress it is somewhat difficult to determine what is the precise mission of the Anglo-Indian journalist. If it be "to inform, to instruct, to amuse," then, if a failure in the first and second parts of the programme, he is often a success in the third, for the scribe of the Anglo-Indian newspaper is frequently, and without knowing it, a born humourist. This fact is never more apparent than when he is "set on" to beat the Congress dog. It is a noticeable fact that, in honour of the Congress, all the Anglo-Indian organs play the same tune, with variations. The *Englishman* starts the new year on old lines, peculiarly its own, and its brief but bitter article on "The Opening of the Congress" is in that journal's best form—lack of logic with an abundance of abuse being its characteristic features. When it is dealing with any popular or progressive movement one hardly looks for an exhibition of good taste or fair play from Calcutta's champion of cliques and *coteries*. But one is hardly prepared for that ancient expedient of quoting from "a letter addressed to us." This is the latest *ruse* of the *Englishman*. Commenting upon the closing sentences of the President's address, this refined and sensitive critic says: "It pains us to descend from these lofty heights to a lower, but more practical level." "Very different sentiments," it continues, "were expressed in a letter addressed to us by another Congress enthusiast, who writes with a vigour and feeling all his own." After which peroration the *Englishman* treats us to the following: "The time shall come when we will kick out of India the whole set of you pale-faced braggarts, and rule our country in the name of our good Empress." Who was the author of this letter? It smacks somewhat of the written-to-order-impromptus which not unfrequently grace the "correspondence" column of anti-Congress journals, and which sceptical readers place in the same category with the letters signed "Conservative Working-Man" or "Son of the Soil" in Tory newspapers at election times. The views expressed in these letters have a strange resemblance to those of the newspapers in which they appear. We will assume the *Englishman* to be above that sort of thing; and perhaps, until the identity of that "Congress enthusiast" is revealed, it were premature to ask whether the feelings expressed were "all his own." Was the letter anonymous, or did it bear an authentic signature —"not necessarily for publication but as a gurantee of good faith"? These are questions which the *Englishman* alone can answer. There is always something new to be learned from its columns. For instance, the statement that "the Congress stands revealed as a body which has nothing to do with popular wants and grievances" will come as a revelation to many. However, as proof that the *Englishman* dares to be a Daniel, it refers to the President's address as an "extremely able" one. Less from the *Englishman* one might expect—more one dare not hope for.

It is more a matter for regret than anger that our persistent, if inconsistent, critic, the *Pioneer*, should discover "marvellous inconsistencies" in some of the Congress speeches. This charge, coming from such a quarter, is an unfortunate one. Even if a fellow-feeling fails to make our critics "wondrous kind," we might reasonably look for silent sympathy from those sharing a fellow-failing. Yet the clouds that obscure the "views" of Anglo-Indian scribes are not without promise of a clearer horizon. Where the force of good example is not only felt, but acknowledged, there is hope; and the frank self-criticisms, or "heart-searchings," of earnest Congress speakers have already borne good fruit. First among our critics to take the hint and to testify to the value of wholesome introspection is the *Pioneer* itself. Open confession is good for the soul, and a New Year's retrospective "leader" an excellent medium for easing a newspaper's conscience. There is a promise of better things in the admission that "papers, like individuals, cannot look back over the past without seeing an abundance of mistakes to regret and faults to deplore, errors of taste and judgment, lapses from fairness sometimes, and prejudice." In so becoming a manner does the *Pioneer* celebrate its anniversary, and this stray leaf from its "confession book" makes by no means an ill-chosen birthday card. It is to be hoped that its sentiments may become those of the whole Anglo-Indian Press. Nothing could be more welcome than a universal awakening of its long-dormant conscience.

One prominent feature of the hostile criticisms on the Eleventh Congress was the ill-disguised hope of a "split" in the Congress camp. The gentlemen of the Anglo-Indian Press were evidently, like a certain pugnacious Hibernian, "living in hopes of a row." Their hopes, if high, were short-lived. That anything approaching a serious rupture would not have been hailed with acclamation by the reporters and "special correspondents" of certain "patriotic" journals, it would be hard indeed to believe. Seldom were prophets of impending disaster more confident. Of their prophecies would it be uncharitable to say that the wish was father to the thought? But the false prophets, if foolish before, have not shown themselves wise after the event. Their disappointment is no doubt too great to admit of disguise, though some amongst them try to conceal their chagrin at the non-fulfilment of their predictions of a "scene." They unconsciously deplore the absence of dissension by bitterly attacking the men and methods through whom and by which a peaceful solution of unforeseen difficulties was arrived at.

The *Times of India*, in pleading the cause of social reform, conveniently ignores the fact that the National Congress also holds a brief on the same side and in the same case. The *Times* attempts to draw the proverbial red herring across the path of political progress. Two brief extracts from the same article will suffice to indicate its policy and the strange fears that influence it. "In dealing elsewhere with the Congress as an agency hostile or indifferent to social reform, we have," it says, "exhibited one of its chief defects as an educator of public opinion"; after which the Congress is described as having for one of its chief aims "the removal of the Englishman [or does it mean the *Englishman?*] from his present place of influence in the Administration."

It is a truism that any stick is good enough to beat the Congress; but, on this occasion, the available sticks must have been few in number, for the same cudgel appears to have been passed from hand to hand, and to have done yeoman service. The *Bombay Gazette* comes forward as yet another disinterested champion of Social Reform. It tells us that "the Congress has been persuaded by the reactionaries of Poona to spurn the Social Conference from its doors." The picture of the Social Conference being driven from home by its co-worker is a truly pathetic one, whilst it does infinite credit to the tender sympathies and powerful imagination of the *Bombay Gazette*.

Perhaps the Twelfth Congress will find some improvement in the methods and the manners of its critics.—Yours, etc.,

London, February 10th. CRITICUS.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MARCH, 1896.

THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

The second Session of the fourteenth Parliament of Queen Victoria was opened on February 11th. The Queen's Speech, which was not quite so long as a sermon, set forth, in addition to no fewer than thirteen distinct proposals for domestic legislation, a remarkable and alarming catalogue of foreign difficulties. Shortly after the present Government took office, Mr. G. N. Curzon, M.P., who seems to combine the grace of the courtier with the dignity of the pedagogue, assured the British public that already in many parts of the world they had evidence of the salutary change. Matters which, under the wicked Liberals, had dragged along, now found a speedy solution. Crises which had impended in Lord Rosebery's time disappeared as if by magic at Lord Salisbury's — and Mr. Curzon's — approach. The irresistible conclusion was, Mr. Curzon added, that a different impression had been formed abroad of the calibre of the new Government. If Mr. Curzon is capable of regret, he must be sorry he spoke. He and his colleagues are now confronted with such an accumulation of foreign trouble as has never within recent times claimed the attention of Parliament. It is the same story whether we look to America, to Asia, or to Africa. If Mr. Curzon's test were just, as it is not, foreign opinion of the calibre of the present Government must be uncomplimentary indeed. The course of subsequent events ought to have reminded Mr. Curzon and his friends that he who putteth on his armour should not boast himself as he that putteth it off. Mr. Balfour, that we may do him justice, stood in no need of the warning. He had not been many weeks in office when he volunteered the prediction that the difficulties of the Government would arise not in domestic affairs but in international relations. Difficulties may yet arise in both quarters. It has, indeed, happened more than once that, under a Conservative Government, attention has been diverted from needs and expectations at home by excursions and alarms abroad. This piece of history may, of course, repeat itself. But the present Government, which has the largest majority, has also the longest programme of modern times. Its followers are essentially sectional, and if they are to shout together they will have to be humoured separately. Will the ardent Churchman be satisfied by the relief of rural rates? Will the distressed landlord begin to prosper when "voluntary" schools receive further subsidies from public funds? Will the able-bodied man in search of employment—the denizen of Lord Salisbury's "black stream of distrust"—be content if the Transvaal question is amicably determined? Will the industrial veteran in search of a pension consent to be put off with a reference to Armenia? The answers to questions like these are the measure of the Government's difficulties. Abroad its hands are full. At home it depends upon the favour of many heterogeneous sections whose expectations, if they are to be satisfied, will need the undivided energy of the Government. There are, after all, some feats which are beyond even a majority of 150.

If there was one charge which, above all others, the Conservative Opposition was never tired of bringing against the late Liberal Government, it was the charge of "log-rolling." Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, and afterwards Lord Rosebery and his colleagues, were accused of parading an enormous programme, which was designed, not to become law, but to keep together the discordant "items" of their party. Accordingly, while in the House of Lords the theory was urged that no Bill might become law which had not been singly approved by a united electorate, in the House of Commons the maxim was enforced that one Session must produce no more than one measure. Viewed in the light of these doctrines, the legislative proposals of the Government are, like Sam Weller's knowledge of London, extensive and peculiar. Here is the little list of subjects in tabular form:—

1. The "extension and improvement of the naval defences of the Empire"—"the most important subject."
2. Measures to mitigate agricultural distress.
3. Further assistance of "voluntary" schools.
4. Compensation of workmen for injuries.
5. Amendment of the Irish Land Acts.
6. Amendment of the law relating to public health in Scotland.
7. The avoidance and settlement of trade disputes.
8. Facilities for the construction of light railways in the United Kingdom.
9. The regulation of public companies.
10. Restrictions upon the "importation" (*sic*) of destitute aliens.
11. Amendment of the law relating to the London water supply.
12. Institution of a Board of Agriculture in Ireland.
13. Amendment of the law of evidence.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"Thirteen all"—not a lucky number, but a large order for a single Session. It is plain, however, that the Government does not regard the various measures as equally important. The first is officially described as most important. The next five receive each a separate paragraph in the Queen's Speech. The last seven are disposed of together in an "omnibus" paragraph at the end. Perhaps it may be assumed, therefore, that (say) the first few weeks of the Session will be taken up with the first half-dozen measures. We may also note that, although this catalogue of measures is tolerably long, it is not so long as the catalogue of promises which were offered to the electors by Conservative candidates at the General Election. Mr. Balfour is commonly regarded as one of the most sceptical and least effusive members of his party. But the electioneering "literature" which was displayed in his constituency last summer promised the following boons which are not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne:—(i) the "referendum"; (ii) classification of paupers; (iii) improvements in the dwellings of the poor; (iv) extension of small holdings; (v) centralisation of poor-law and school board rates; (vi) church defence (or is this the same as number 3 above?); (vii) registration reform; (viii) redistribution of seats; (ix) facilities to enable working men to purchase their houses; (x) fair wages for Government workmen; (xi) local government for Ireland; and last, but not least, (xii) old-age pensions.

"I have urged you," said Mr. Chamberlain at Leeds in September, 1894, "I have urged you as "representatives of a united party to see that it is "your duty first to formulate, then sincerely to "undertake and to promote, a living policy of "domestic and social reform; and I do not hesitate "to say that the Unionist party is, in my judgment, "peculiarly fitted both by its traditions and by its "composition to undertake this great constructive "work." In the following month, at Birmingham, Mr. Chamberlain produced his programme. It consisted chiefly of three proposals:—old age pensions, improvement of working-class dwellings, and the grant of State loans to enable working men to become the proprietors of their houses. The programme was unauthorised, it fell as flat as a pancake, and Mr. Chamberlain's proposals find no place in the Queen's Speech. The omission can hardly be gratifying to Mr. Chamberlain, but amid the incense of praise which has been offered up in his honour during the past few weeks he is doubtless prepared to overlook minor slights. The debate on the address was concerned chiefly with foreign affairs, which, as was to be expected, have absorbed public attention in the United Kingdom since the beginning of this storm-laden new year. The Queen's Speech contained three references to India, touching the Pamirs, the Siam Agreement, and Chitral respectively. These topics we discuss elsewhere. On the last-named Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, submitted a suitable amendment, and was able to muster the respectable total of 79 in the division lobby. The Government does not appear to have weighed the imprudence of encouraging discontent in India at a time when it is faced with grave difficulties and anxieties in all quarters of the globe. Lord Salisbury's failure in Armenia, following his brave words at the Guildhall, has produced a deep and widespread feeling of humiliation, and, although Mr. Chamberlain acted promptly and firmly in dealing with Dr. Jameson's raid, his conduct of the affair has not been free from mistakes, and we are not yet out of the wood. The Venezuela question has been the subject of interesting and academic speeches which add little that is new to the discussion, though they testify to the now general desire for arbitration. The moral that educated India will inevitably draw from all these transactions is not one which patriotic Englishmen can regard with much satisfaction. In Ashanti we have had recourse to a needless expedition for the purpose, and with the effect, of bringing the weak to their knees. In the Transvaal, while Dr. Jameson's raid has been condemned, it has been shown that violence is sometimes a remarkably potent method of agitation. In Venezuela and in Armenia, where the possibilities of opposition are more formidable, we seem in the one case to have modified our demands, while, in the other case, we have utterly and ignominiously failed. But in Chitral, in dealing with native tribes and unrepresented taxpayers, we congratulate ourselves upon having violated, in the name of "prestige," the express and explicit pledges of our own proclamation.

THE CHITRAL AMENDMENT.

THE NESCIENCE OF LORD G. HAMILTON.

We refer in "Indiana" to the debate in the House of Commons on the Chitral amendment on February 17th, of which a full report will be found in our Parliamentary Supplement.

Lord George Hamilton deprecated, in vehement and occasionally abusive language, the allegation that the retention of Chitral involved a breach of faith, and asked, rhetorically, if Sir W. Wedderburn was acquainted with the facts of the case.

Lord George Hamilton's amazing speech suggests—not rhetorically—the same question with reference to himself.

The Viceroy's proclamation, he said, "merely applied to the territory between Peshawar and Chitral, and it had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral."

The proclamation is given in full at page 39 of the Blue-book (C.—7,864), "Correspondence relating to Chitral." It contains these two explicit undertakings:—

(i) "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn."

(ii) "The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes."

Each of these two promises was supplementary of the other. The first promised withdrawal from Chitral; the second promised that no intervening territory should be occupied. Taken together, these

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

promises amounted to a complete pledge against occupation, and the question to whom they were addressed is a question of purely academic interest.

That the proclamation was intended to convey this meaning is conclusively shown by the Chitral Blue-book.

The date of the proclamation (which was not merely issued to the people of Swat and Bajaur, but was also "generally communicated upon the border") was March 14th, 1895. On March 8th Lord Elgin had telegraphed to Sir H. Fowler that certain measures were necessary to "ensure" the "safety" of Dr. Robertson, and on the same day Sir H. Fowler had replied:—

"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary."

The proclamation was issued after the receipt of this reply, and it expressly stated that the purpose of the relief expedition was to compel Umra Khan to retire from Chitral.

Note Sir Henry Fowler's words: "action for securing safety of Robertson and party." On March 18th Lord Elgin telegraphed that orders had been issued for the mobilization of the first division of the field army. At once—on the same day—Sir H. Fowler telegraphed to Lord Elgin:—

"Please let me know why so large a force is considered necessary for securing safety of Robertson and party."

Again we have the phrase "securing safety of Robertson and party." There was not even a hint at that time—the time at which the proclamation was issued—of retention or occupation. Moreover, when the Government of India afterwards suggested the idea, Sir Henry Fowler replied (June 13th, 1895. Blue-book p. 51):—

"Her Majesty's Government. . . . have decided that no military force or European agent shall be kept at Chitral, that Chitral shall be fortified, and that no road shall be made between Peshawar and Chitral. It will follow that all positions beyond our frontier, now held in consequence of the recent relief operations, should be evacuated as speedily as circumstances allow."

This was manifestly Sir H. Fowler's policy and intention from the outset. The expedition was a relief expedition, pure and simple. When Lord George Hamilton succeeded Sir H. Fowler he permitted the Government of India to reverse this policy and to occupy Chitral, and he now vainly seeks to justify a glaring breach of faith on the ground that Chitral is "a much richer country than was anticipated." It would be an odd thing if a man charged with burglary sought to defend himself on the ground that his booty proved more valuable than he had anticipated.

Lord George Hamilton's assertion that the people of Chitral "welcome the English occupation" is open to two criticisms. The first is that, even if it were founded on fact, it would still be irrelevant. The second is that we have heard the same sort of thing before. In fact Lord George Hamilton was answered in advance by Sir Auckland Colvin. In the *Nineteenth Century* for November last Sir Auckland Colvin wrote:—

"For the moment, all is painted *couleur de rose*. The Swat tribesmen, if Simla telegrams may be trusted, are not content merely to condone our occupation of such points in their territory as Chakdara and the Malakand Pass. They insist in demanding that the Government of India should adminster their country. They would even be mortified at the refusal of their request. If this is so, nothing could be happier. . . . . Still, it is well to recall to mind that something very like it has been heard on previous and analogous occasions. Events which belied the accuracy of precisely similar assertions in 1838 are now so distant that their echo has become well-nigh inaudible. But some may remember, and those who have forgotten may be reminded, that in 1838 there were not wanting voices which loudly proclaimed the delight of the Afghan nation at their deliverance from their elected ruler. Four years later, when Afghanistan had unmistakably spoken for itself, those voices were conspicuously silent. It came at length to be recognised that among the Afghans were many who, from complaisance, from compulsion, or from cunning, had protested too much; and whose too effusive expressions of welcome had misled many who were in haste to credit them. With that experience in our minds, it will be as well to suspend judgment as to the credence to be placed in the reports which reach us of the pleasure of the tribesmen at the permanent settlement of British troops within their borders. All that as yet can be seen clearly is that there has been made by the Government of India a fresh departure, which may lead to grave complications, either in the immediate or in a more distant future."

As for the cost of this "forward" move, Lord G. Hamilton said in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn that "he thought the expenditure would be less than was anticipated, and, so far from Indian finance being in a critical condition, they must bear in mind that there had been a considerable remission of taxation by the reduction in the cotton duties." In the same strain of ludicrous optimism Lord George, at the close of his speech, "congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned." Against Lord George Hamilton's congratulations and beliefs we may well set the reasoned conclusions of an ex-Finance Minister like Sir Auckland Colvin. In the article in the *Nineteenth Century* from which we have already quoted, Sir A. Colvin wrote:—

"The situation. . . . is surrounded by clouds and darkness. Is it a time to prophesy smooth things, to smile complacently, to exchange congratulations, to talk comfortably about the clouds going by? It seems, indeed, difficult to understand how it can be believed that the financial outlook, as was said in the recent Indian budget debates, is better than it was three years ago. Three years ago the necessity of re-imposing the cotton duties had not been demonstrated. The Famine Grant had not been appropriated to current revenues. Three years ago the Secretary of State sold his bills at 1s. $2\frac{9}{16}$d.; at present he barely touches 1s. $1\frac{3}{4}$d. The deficit three years ago was Rx. 800,000; now it is estimated at well over a million. For, three years ago, the forward frontier policy had been but recently revived, and we had not made the progress in creating and completing our new dominion and protectorate beyond the Indus which has been achieved of late. Frontier policy and Indian finance are as inseparable as foreign policy and finance in Western countries. There can be no improvement in Indian finance so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension, or exposed to the risk and requirements of war. Consequently there can be no vigorous internal policy, whether of railway development or of other kind. The most experienced are the first to recognise this. 'We know,' it was said in the course of the Chitral debate, 'that at the India Office, and among retired officers, the old-fashioned view prevails. But in India, and it is there where most responsibility rests, opinion is almost invariably opposed to it.' This reminds us of that other *dictum*, in its time also accepted, that 'the opinion of Colley on the frontier question was worth that of twenty Lawrences.' The 'old-fashioned' view has

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

been indicated in the course of this paper, and in the words of its first and greatest exponent. It is the old-fashioned view to 'protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure even for measures which they can both understand and appreciate.' It is the old-fashioned view to 'look for our true policy, our strongest security in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses, in husbanding the finances of India, and in consolidating and multiplying its resources.' If in India, where most responsibility lies, these views are no longer in favour, let us learn why they have been discarded, and what are the views by which they have been replaced. If, on the other hand, their importance is still admitted, let us be told how they are to be made consistent with the present forward policy. Economy, the contentment of our Indian fellow-subjects, and multiplying the resources of British India may be merely the old-fashioned views of the India Office, of retired officers, of dead Viceroys, and of other unconsidered obscurities. But they are, at least, the views which in building up India in the past guided the great men who were charged with the task, and which enabled them to hand over the India of the present day, such as we still see it, to the men who are now responsible. Old-fashioned as they are, they are, therefore, views which will continue to challenge and command consideration till they have been proved unsuited to the India of the future."

These weighty words of Sir Auckland Colvin's, with their contempt of complacent smiles and congratulations, were, it seems, prophetic.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA.

A HEAVY FINANCIAL LOSS.

The "Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1894-95," by Lieutenant-Colonel T. Gracey, R.E., Officiating Director-General of Railways, has just been issued as a Blue-book (C.—7845).

In order to correct the optimism of this report it may be well to bear the following facts in mind.

The following figures show the true financial results to the Government of India, on Imperial account, of the Indian railways in 1884-5 and 1894-5:—[N.B. Rx.90,100 for Exchange Compensation is included in the charges for working expenses in 1894-5.]

INDIAN RAILWAYS (Imperial Account).

	1884-5. Rx.	1894-5. Rx.	Increase. Rx.
Net Traffic Receipts ..	Rx.7,400,192	11,672,600	4,272,408
Charges for Interest, etc.:			
In India	Rx.2,366,258	4,027,700	1,661,442
In England ..	£4,826,816	5,738,700	911,884
Exchange	Rx.1,172,877	4,782,200	3,609,323
Total Charges ..	Rx.8,365,951	14,548,600	6,182,649
Net Loss	Rx.965,759	2,876,000	1,910,241

If from the net loss in each year be deducted the charge for Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange on the basis of the sterling expenditure in 1884-5, the result is as follows:—[N.B. Of the Rx.4,782,200 charged to Exchange in 1894-5, Rx.759,903 was due to increased sterling charges, and not primarily due to the fall in Exchange.]

	1884-5. Rx.	1894-5. Rx.	Increase. Rx.
Actual loss	965,759	2,876,000	1,910,241
Exchange	1,172,877	4,022,297	2,849,420
Profit (Exchange excluded)	Rx.207,118	Rx.1,146,297	Rx.939,179

From the foregoing figures it will be seen that the improvement of the Railway Revenue Account in India is no index of the actual results of the railway enterprise of the Government of India. In 1894-5 the railways cost the Government Rx.2,876,000 net, or Rx.1,910,241 more than in 1884-5, and this is the serious fact which must be kept in mind in considering the railway policy of the Government of India. It does not seem sound finance to borrow in gold for enterprises, however intrinsically desirable, which will probably, owing to the state of the Exchange, result in heavy loss in the future.

The Government of India is practically the owner of all the Indian railways, which have been built at a heavy cost and are maintained at a heavy annual expense. Of course, the Indian railway system is capable of almost infinite development, hardly more than the main trunk lines being yet in existence, and it is, therefore, of importance that that development should proceed upon lines of sound finance. The Government of India have recently been carrying out this development by methods which do not appear to be sound. When a feeder line has to be built, the present practice is to make over the project to a company, the company raising the capital and the Government building the line, and either working the completed undertaking or arranging that it shall be worked by an existing company. After a certain number of years the Government will inevitably buy out the company at what is certain to be an unnecessarily high figure.

This system seems to combine four distinct disadvantages:

(1) The capital in the first instance is raised on less favourable terms than the Government could command;
(2) A large amount of money is wasted in promotion money, commission, and other preliminary expenses of company-floating;
(3) A whole separate staff and establishment, with directorate, etc., is brought into existence, at unnecessary expense for a line which is dependent for its existence upon the trunk railway, and which could be, and is, most effectively and economically worked with the original undertaking; and
(4) A small and separate railway, with separate interests, is planted in the middle of a great system of State Railways, and must ultimately be bought out on terms less favourable to the State than those on which it could originally have been built.

It would be well if the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure would call for documents showing the latest terms upon which the Government of India is prepared to promote the construction of railways by companies. A statement should be asked for showing the financial results of every railway since construction, the terms upon which each was constructed, and the future rights and responsibilities of the Government with regard to them.

The Government of India some years ago became entitled to purchase the Great Indian Peninsular, the Bombay and Baroda and other guaranteed railways, but waived their right for a period of years in return for certain modifications of the contracts. A statement should be called for showing approximately, for each railway:

(1) What is the present yearly loss to the revenues of India on account of this waiver by the Government;
(2) What is the present yearly gain to the revenues of India on account of the modifications of the contracts; and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

3) What was the price at which the Government might have purchased these railways in 1875, and what is the probable price which the Government will have to pay on the next date on which it can exercise the option of purchase, and when.

With regard to the Bengal Central Railway, it is desirable to know why a guarantee was given to this company and upon what terms, and what the yearly loss has been. In the Finance Accounts of the Government of India there is a constantly recurring footnote with reference to this railway, to the effect that "although for convenience classified among State Railways, this line is the property of the Bengal Central Railway Company."

The following extract from an article in the *Economist* for July 27th, 1895, upon the Administration Report of Indian Railways, 1894-5, gives a very clear and authoritative statement of the nature of one portion of the present contracts between the Government of India and the Guaranteed Railway Companies:—

"The result of the working of the Great Indian Peninsular Railway, which is clearly brought out in the Report, shows that during the first half of 1894 the net earnings amounted to Rx. 1,265,800, while during the second half of the year the net earnings only amounted to Rx. 358,700, or a total for the year of Rx. 1,624,500. Now, as we have already explained, in order to arrive at the surplus profits, which have to be declared each half-year separately, the guaranteed interest in sterling has to be converted into rupees at the nominal rate of 1s. 10d., and not at their true value, and in the cash of this railway the sum to be thus set aside amounts half-yearly to Rx. 657,700. Upon this basis of calculation the surplus profits during the first half of the year amounted to Rx. 608,100, of which the company's half-share was Rx. 304,000. During the second half of the year there were no surplus profits. The net receipts, in fact, fell far short of the amount required to meet the guaranteed interest, and owing to the arrangement by which the profits are declared on a half-yearly instead of a yearly basis, the surplus profits at the end of the first half-year do not form a set-off against the loss during the second half, and the Government had, therefore, to make good the loss, partly out of its own share of surplus profits, and partly from the general revenues of the country.

"The net result on the year's working was therefore, this: The Company obtained Rx. 304,000 of so-called surplus profits, which enabled them to pay their shareholders an extra dividend of 16s. 4d. over and above the guaranteed interest of 5 per cent. The Government, on the other hand, had to pay the guaranteed interest, which at the average rate for the official year amounted to no less a sum than Rx. 2,207,800. To meet this, they had the net receipts for the whole year, less the company's sehre of surplus profits, viz., (Rx. 1,624,300—Rx. 304,000), Rx. 1,320,300, and they therefore had to provide Rx. 887,500 to make good the guaranteed interest. In other words, while the company were able to distribute an extra dividend of 16s. 4d., the State suffered a loss of Rx. 887.500. Had, on the other hand, the terms of the contract simply provided a 5 per cent. sterling guarantee with a half share of any surplus profits at the end of the year after meeting the guaranteed interest out of the earnings of the undertaking, the company would have had no suplus profits with which to declare an extra dividend, and as the whole of the net earnings would have gone towards meeting the guaranteed interest, the loss of the State would have been reduced to (Rx. 2,207,800 — Rx. 1,624,300) Rx. 583,500, a loss solely due to the fall in the value of the rupee and therefore pratically unavoidable.

"It is evident, therefore, that the loss which the Indian Government has had to bear in connection with the three older guaranteed companies still in existence, and which during the past year alone amounted to over Rx. 1,500,000, has not, as is usually asserted, been solely due to the depreciation of the rupee, but must to a considerable extent be attributed to the very faulty nature of the contracts with the companies. It must also be remembered that not only do these contracts enable the companies to declare higher dividends than their properties really earn, but they also naturally enhance the price of the company's stock in the money market, and as, when the Indian Government wishes to exercise their option of purchase, they have to do so at a valuation based on the average market value of the stock for three years previous to the date of purchase, it follows that they will be compelled to purchase at an inflated capital value."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Arthur Charles Trevor, C.S.I., of the Indian Civil Service, to be a member of the Council of the Governor General of India, in succession to Sir Charles Pritchard, K.C.S.I., who is compelled to resign for reasons of health. Mr. Trevor is at present a member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. John Nugent, of the Bombay Civil Service, as a member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay, in the room of Mr. A. C. Trevor, C.S.I., who has been appointed to the Governor-General's Council.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Ralph Sillery Benson as a judge of the High Court of Judicature in Madras. "Mr. Benson's appointment will," the official announcement ran, "fill the vacancy in the Court caused in 1887 by the retirement of Mr. Brandt. Mr. Benson has been a member of the Indian Civil Service since 1873. He was the officer who carried through the settlement of lands in the Nilgiri districts, and has had a varied judicial experience in India."

Sir W. Wedderburn has given notice, for February 27th, of the following question in the House of Commons:—

"To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Select Committee of the Madras Legislative Council in reporting on the Bill which afterwards became Act II of 1894 (Madras Proprietary Village Service Act) stated that they had no information regarding the duties of village servants, other than the village accountant:

"Whether the Act has been brought into force; and, if not, why not:

"And, whether, according to Mr. J. D. Rees, head-assistant collector at Tinnevelley, and other authorities, interference with the ancient village police system has led to an increase of crime."

In Sir Charles Aitchison, who died at Oxford on February 18th, the Empire has, as the *Times* truly said, lost one of the most distinguished of its Indian administrators. "In the history of the growth and the consolidation of our Indian Empire his name must ever be associated with that of Lord Lawrence all through the eventful period from 1856 to 1889." Writing a few months ago to a private correspondent Sir Charles Aitchison said:

"I am an adherent of the Lawrence, or non-aggressive, school—not the grotesque thing which it is the fashion to ridicule in the daily Press. Lord Lawrence's policy was no selfish policy of isolation. His desire was to fulfil all offices of good neighbourhood, to encourage peaceful intercourse with the tribes beyond our frontier, to develop trade with them, to induce them to settle down to the cultivation of their lands, to help them in our markets, dispensaries, and schools, and, when practicable, to arbitrate in their disputes. But he wished them to be left to manage their own affairs, and to choose their own

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

rulers, which he believed they could do better than we could do or them. Above all things, he had a horror of setting up our nominees as rulers, to be supported by English bayonets. His policy never had a fair chance; it was always disturbed by violent forward aggressions. As regards Chitral, we ought never to have gone there at all."

As will be seen from our Parliamentary Report Lord G. Hamilton stated on February 13th that he would be glad to lay the Durand Treaty on the Table, that, so far as he knew, no question of the extirpation or enslavement of the Kafir race had arisen, and that certainly no such contingency was contemplated when the Durand Treaty was agreed to. On February 20th Lord G. Hamilton added that the Government of India had "desired that telegraphic reports be sent to them from Chitral of any further operations." On February 18th a conference, jointly convened by the Aborigines Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society, was held at Westminster Palace Hotel. Mr. A. Pease, M.P., presided, and among those present were Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Lewis Fry, M.P., and Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P. A resolution moved by Mr. Bhownaggree and seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn, was unanimously carried, protesting against "the measures now being taken by the Amír of Afghanistan for the subjugation of the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush," declaring that "this ancient and heroic community ought, in the interests of science as well as of civilisation and humanity, to be protected from the merciless attack which is being made upon their lives, property, and social organisation," and earnestly appealing to Her Majesty's Government "promptly and vigorously to exert its influence with Her Majesty's highly subsidised ally the Amír by requiring that the present persecution shall be abandoned and the Kafirs left in possession of their hardly acquired liberties and their historic landmarks."

Lord George Hamilton, M.P., has appointed Mr. Gerald Loder, M.P., to be his "private Secretary for Parliamentary purposes." Mr. Loder, who has represented Brighton since 1889, is the fourth son of the late Sir Robert Loder. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, and called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1888. He was for some time private secretary to Mr. Ritchie at the Local Government Board. Mr. Loder is described as "a Conservative, and supporter of the Liberal Unionist alliance with the Conservative party." The description seems to suggest that there are Conservatives who do not support that alliance.

We take the following from the *Times* of February 19th:—"At a meeting of the East Indian Association, at their rooms, Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, on Monday, (February 17th) Sir Lepel Griffin presiding, Mr. Alfred Nundy read a paper on the Indian National Congress. The chairman in his opening remarks, said that Mr. Nundy was well known to most of them as one who had won his spurs as a barrister in the Madras Presidency, and had made himself an authority on the subject under notice. It had been said that the question was one with which the association had nothing to do, but the council in no way took that view of the matter. Any question in which a large part of the most educated and intelligent of the Indian people took interest came within the scope of the discussions of the association.

"Mr. Nundy spoke of the Congress under two heads—first its members and then its objects. He said that the resolutions passed at the Congress were not unreasonable or extravagant. Some of these demands had already been partially granted by the Government, the reasonableness of others had been recognised, and others could claim in their support promises made by the Government in years past and the opinion of some of the most competent authorities of the present day. The demands were made by men who, at the sacrifice of much time and trouble and expense, met every year to discuss questions of the most vital importance to the millions who formed the population of India. It was true that, so far as the masses were concerned, the Congress had no direct authority to speak for them, but in the history of most civilised nations it would be seen the educated and reflecting classes represented the views and interests of those who, through ignorance or other causes, were incapable of asserting their own grievances. The National Congress could not be reproached for overlooking their interests, for a great many of the resolutions passed had special reference to their wants and requirements. It might be said that the aim of the Congress was to bring together all the conflicting elements, and to combine them into one harmonious whole, to act as the medium of communication between the Government on the one hand and the people of India on the other, and to consolidate the union between England and India by securing the introduction of such reforms as were desirable in the interests of the people. India knew the advantages of British rule, but these reforms would have to be effected."

At the National Indian Association's soirée held on February 13th, in the East Conference Hall of the Imperial Institute, the guests were received by Lady Lyall, Lady Bayley, and Miss Manning (hon. sec.). Among those present were Sir Alfred Lyall, Sir Steuart Bayley, the newly-appointed Governor of Madras (Sir Arthur Havelock) and Lady Havelock, Mr. and Mrs. Carmichael, Colonel Mackenzie (late Resident at Haidarabad) and Mrs. Mackenzie, Dr. Theodore Cooke, Mr. and Mrs. Barclay Scriven, Mrs. Keatinge, Mr. Thornton, C.S.I., a young chief from Kathiawar, Mrs. Gupta and two daughters, Miss Cock, M.D., Mr. Alex. Rogers, Colonel Maude, Miss Toynbee, Mr. Candy, Miss Plumptre, Shrimant Sampatrao, brother of the Gaekwar of Baroda, Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Nundy, Mr. A. Doe, Prof. and Mrs. Cavalier, Miss S. Chattopadhya, Mr. Martin Wood, and Mr. Geflowski. Many nationalities were represented, and some of the Indian costumes were very rich in gold and colours. There was a good programme of music, which included songs by Madame Pheroze Langrana, in her finished and graceful style, a humorous "sketch" by Mr. R. K. Sorabji, and a song by a lady from Calcutta, Miss Helen Le Franc. Conversation was very general, and a most sociable spirit pervaded the assembly, which was unique in the mingling of East and West.

The new volume of the *Liberal Magazine* (Liberal

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Publication Department, Parliament Street) is an invaluable compendium of the events of last year. Besides a political diary and brief extracts from the more important political speeches, it contains useful monthly appendices dealing with current questions, recent legislation, and so forth. The articles signed "A. B."—initials which imperfectly conceal the name of that brilliant critic and essayist, Mr. Augustine Birrell—are masterpieces in their way. Not the least admirable feature of the volume is an index, which seems to be tolerably complete, though we detect some curious omissions. The idea of the compilation as a whole is so excellent as to deserve more scientific execution. The plan of "setting out" subjects in tabular form might well be developed, and the best speeches reproduced in skeleton outline. Even in its present form the volume is, if not a possession for ever, at least a valuable storehouse of facts for future use.

THE CHITRAL DEBATE.

DIVISION LIST.

The following is the list of members of the House of Commons who, in the division on February 17th, voted in favour of Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address:—

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.).
*Baker, Sir John.
*Burns, John.
Caldwell, James.
Cameron, Robert.
Causton, Richd. Knight.
*Channing, F. Allston.
*Clough, Walter Owen.
*Commins, Andrew.
*Condon, Thomas Jos.
Crean, Eugene.
Daly, James.
*Dalziel, James Henry.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan).
Davitt, Michael.
Dillon, John.
*Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Doughty, George.
Ellis, Thomas Edward (Merionethshire).
*Esmonde, Sir Thomas.
Evans, Samuel T.
Farrell, James P. (Cavan, W.).
Ffrench, Peter.
*Field, Wm. (Dublin).
Finucane, John.
Foster, Sir. Walter (Derby Co.).
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. H. J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford.
Grey, Sir Ed. (Berwick).
Griffiths, Ellis J.
Haldane, Richd. Burdon.
*Harrington, Timothy.
Harrison, Charles.
Harwood, George.
Hazell, Walter.
Healy, Timothy M. (N. Louth).
Jameson, Major J. E.
Joicey, Sir James.
Kenny, Joseph E. (Dublin, Col. Green).
*Kilbride, Denis.
Knox, Ed. Francis Vesey.
Labouchere, Henry.
Langley, Batty.
*Lawson, Sir Wilfrid (Cumberland).
*Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington).
*Lewis, John Herbert.
Lloyd-George, David.
*Lough, Thomas.
*Lyell, Sir Leonard.
Macaleese, Daniel.
*MacNeill, J. G. Swift.
*M'Cartan, Michael.
M'Dermott, Patrick.
M'Leod, John.
*Mandeville, J. Francis.
Morley, Charles.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny).
O'Connor, A. (Donegal).
Pease, J. A. (Northumb).
*Pickersgill, Ed. Hare.
Redmond, Wm. (Clare).
*Roberts, J. B. (Eifion).
*Roberts, John H. (Denbighs).
Robson, Wm. Snowdon.
Samuel, J. (Stockton-on-Tees).
Shee, James John.
*Sheehy, David.
*Smith, Samuel (Flint).
*Spicer, Albert.
Sullivan, Donal (Westmeath).
Tanner, Charles Kearns.
*Thomas, A. (Glam., E.).
Thomas, D.A. (Merthyr).
Tully, Jasper.
*Weir, James Galloway.
Williams, J. C. (Notts.).
*Wilson, John (Govan).
Yoxall, James Henry.

Tellers for the Ayes, Sir William Wedderburn* and Mr. Schwann*.

* Denotes member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

"THE CHITRAL BLUNDER."

There is, happily, good reason to believe that the "forward" frontier policy, as it is called, is coming to be regarded in the true light by a considerable section of the British public. To be condemned—except by young officers who, like Captain Costigan, are not only brave but know it too, and like to take out their courage and, as it were, give it an airing in company—it needs only to be understood. Detested by the people of India, and denounced by the majority and the best of military "experts," this baneful policy is directly responsible for the present embarrassed condition of Indian finances. Witness the authority of two such capable judges as Sir David Barbour and Sir Auckland Colvin, both of them ex-Finance Ministers. Strategically, it is condemned by men like General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, Sir Donald Stewart, and Sir Charles Gough. It reverses the settled policy of the Government of India, approved by the people of India, under Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Ripon. It was invented by Mr. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury, and initiated by Lord Lytton. Since its inauguration in 1878 it has cost the people of India more than thirty millions of money, and it is not merely useless but positively dangerous. Its ostensible purpose is to diminish the danger of Russian invasion. Yet it literally paves the way for the Russian invader, while, through an unceasing drain upon impoverished taxpayers, it saps the contentment of the people of India. "The paramount consideration in my mind," wrote Lord Lawrence in 1867 in a famous minute, "has always been, and still is, a regard for the true interests of the State. I am convinced that we can gain nothing, but are pretty sure to lose a great deal in prestige, in honour, in the valuable lives of our officers and soldiers, by interfering actively in the affairs of Central Asia; and that, so far from strengthening our tenure of India, we may thus shake it to its very foundations." Lord Lawrence is voted old-fashioned by young military officers afflicted by "K.C.B.-mania." Accordingly, in the year of grace, 1895, we find our Chauvinists at Simla advancing from Peshawar to Chitral—more than the distance from London to Manchester—and deliberately throwing away the advantages of the colossal mountain barrier which had hitherto sepa-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

rated British Indian territory from the hypothetical Russian invader.

If the brothers Younghusband, in their interesting and tell-tale volume entitled "The Relief of Chitral," had confined themselves, as they might well have done, to purely military incidents, the foregoing remarks would, of course, have been out of court. But they have done nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they give us a preliminary chapter which purports to explain "the causes of the war," and a final chapter which purports to describe "the present situation." These chapters, grossly imperfect and misleading as they are, inevitably become the most important section of the book. For the immediate military campaign is done and over, and we did not need to be told with what courage, resolution, and loyalty our soldiers, whether British or Indian, carried out, in the teeth of grave dangers and unique natural obstacles, the orders which they ought never to have received. Two questions, however, remain. How came the relief of Chitral to be necessary at all? And how many more escapades of a similar kind is the Indian taxpayer and the Lancashire cotton spinner to expect in the future? The brothers Younghusband, whose account of the military operations is adequate enough, though of course it is written in the style not of Thucydides but of "special correspondents," answer these questions not so much by what they say as by what they omit. If, however, we supplement their narrative from external sources it becomes luminous and valuable. In the Blue-book on Chitral which was recently published the very first despatch showed that, so long ago as 1877, the Government of India had designs upon Chitral. It was not until the ingenuity of eighteen years had been expended that the desirable situation was realised—in which it became plausibly necessary to relieve a British force. It was then the old story. British soldiers were in danger and needed to be rescued. Then, in Mr. Balfour's formula, where the British soldier had been, a Tory Government determined that he must remain. The first chapter of the volume before us resolves itself, unintentionally, into a narrative of British endeavours, especially from Gilghit, to secure or manufacture some reason for active intervention in the affairs of Chitral, while the final chapter indicates gravely enough the dangers that remain.

The opportunity for intervention came when, after the death of Aman-ul-Mulk, and the murder of his second son, Afzul-ul-Mulk, Sher Afzul, the uncle of the latter, established himself as Mehtar. The British officer at Gilghit, gratuitously and offensively, then dispatched a British force with the weakling Nizam-ul-Mulk to drive out Sher Afzul. Sher Afzul fled back without delay into Afghanistan, Nizam-ul-Mulk became nominal ruler, and the British hold upon Chitral seemed to be as secure as it was aggressive and uncalled for. Nizam-ul-Mulk was afterwards shot by his half-brother, Amir-ul-Mulk, and Chitral was "invaded" by Umra Khan. *Hinc illae lacrimae.* But to describe these events or any of them as the cause of the Chitral imbroglio is to confuse the occasion, and almost the effects, with the cause. The cause lay deep down in the persistent policy of ambitious soldiers, abetted by weak viceroys, which ever since the seventies has waxed under a Tory and waned under a Liberal Government. The amusing thing is that the brothers Younghusband talk of "we," "we," "we," as if it were British money that was squandered in Chitral. But, of course, it was Indian money, just as it is Indian money that keeps the India Office going, and pays Lord George Hamilton's salary. It is also amusing to find these military chroniclers talking about the Chitral trouble as "upon the northern frontier of India." It was, of course, some hundreds of miles beyond that frontier. Elsewhere, indeed, our authors explain (p. 56) that "four high ranges of mountains, and three considerable rivers, besides mountain torrents, had to be crossed by the southern column of the relief force." It does not seem to have occurred to them that in describing the difficulties of the march and the hardships of the troops they were describing means of protection against Russia, which the "forward" policy will impair or remove. Still less do the brothers Younghusband appear to appreciate the singular folly of embittering or annihilating the indigenous tribesmen of the mountains, who value their independence before their lives. It has been well said that in politics, as in physics, where there is no resistance there is no support. The agents of the "forward" policy depose strong men in order to set up puppets, subservient to themselves. Their crowning achievement in Chitral was to enthrone Shuja-ul-Mulk, "an intelligent, trustworthy little boy, nine or ten years old." The Younghusbands of this best of all possible worlds are convinced of the paramount necessity of teaching the "wild impressionable people across our frontier" to believe in our "unwavering consistency of purpose." Apparently the best mode of enforcing the lesson is first to issue a proclamation saying that we intend to withdraw from their territory, and then, having issued it, to remain.—*The Star.*

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALWAR.

"A PLEA FOR FAIR HEARING."

Under the headings "Prince and Political; Máhárája of Jhalwar; A Plea for Fair Hearing," the *Daily Chronicle* of February 20th published the following:

We have received the following cable from Mr. Motilal, editor of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, Calcutta, a well-known organ of Indian native opinion, concerning the case of the Prince of Jhalwar. We cannot, of course, vouch for our correspondent's facts, but the case seems to us eminently one for careful enquiry and cautious action:—

CALCUTTA, *Thursday.*

The Jhalwar telegrams in the *Times* are misleading, for they are summarised from the *Pioneer*, which is admittedly the organ of the political agents. An ancestor of the Jhalwar Prince did inestimable service to the Government during the Mutiny. The present Prince saved the political agent, Mr. Saddler, from a tiger, though Mr. Saddler was inimical to him before. The previous politicals spoke favourably,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

but the present political disagreed in minor matters, and sent a report of the charges against the Prince, unknown to the Prince or the public. The *Pioneer* says the Prince contemplated rebellion against politicals, and was serving ball cartridge to his troops. The charge is absurd, as, according to the *Pioneer*, the Prince has about 200 ill-armed troops. The *Pioneer* again shifted its ground, and charged the Prince with intimidating the agent with a revolver. The Prince indignantly denies this, and says he saw the agent alone and unarmed. The politicals are urging the Viceroy to depose the Prince unheard. This has created an intense sensation throughout the country. Indian Princes are alarmed, and the public demand an open enquiry. So does the Prince. The Jhalwar subjects petitioned the Government on behalf of their popular Prince.

Accounts of the Patna Prince's suicide, supposed to have been committed under a sense of official wrong, whose redress was not expected, has brought the Jhalwar case to the front for the prevention of similar mischief. It will be disgraceful if the Prince is deposed unheard. Particulars have been sent to Mr. Caine.

In a leading article published on the same day the *Chronicle* wrote:—

We publish in another column a telegram sent to us by the editor of the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta. The statements contained in his message and in the files of his journal, which we have before us seem to us to call for close examination by the Home Government. All the information that the country has had before it up to the present as to the proceedings against the Máhárája of Jhalawar has come through the *Times*. In a couple of telegrams from its Calcutta correspondent it has been stated that the Máhárája has been playing the tyrant and misgoverning his State, that a reign of terror was established in his capital of Jhalra Patan, and that Captain Evans-Gordon, the Political Agent had suggested to the Government last October that Jahlim Singh, the Máhárája, was unfit to govern. We are further informed that Mr. Crosthwaite, a high official was sent by the Indian Government to make enquiries. On arriving in the capital, in December, this gentleman discovered "that affairs had almost reached a critical state," and that the Máhárája was serving out ammunition to his Sepoys, and was engaging Pathan mercenaries. So grave was the condition of affairs that two squadrons of the Central India Horse and a couple of companies of the Deoli Irregular Force were ordered up to the capital as a protection to the Political Agent, and there they remain. The *Times* correspondent further suggested that the Máhárája was not always fully responsible for his actions, and that he had long shown signs of eccentricity. This explanation, we may remark in passing, seems to be a familiar one to Indian officials. Last June the Prince of Patna after being subjected to a long term of harsh and humiliating treatment at the hands of the Political Agent, shot his wife and then committed suicide. The official view of the case, according to the *Times*, was one of insanity. The Chief Commissioner explained that the Máhárája was undoubtedly insane; indeed he had shown eccentricities of conduct and outbursts of temper ever since his accession in 1894. The Agent's view may, or may not, have been correct; but it would almost seem as if a political agent who has differences with the native princes has only to follow Dr. Blandford's procedure in the Lanchester case in order to bring the delinquent to subjection. Meanwhile, however, these two incidents have created a profound feeling throughout India. The Máhárája of Jhalwar is virtually a prisoner; a claimant to the throne has been put in command of his troops; and his deposition may be expected at any moment. One cannot wonder that the three hundred native princes and the millions of subjects under their rule should be closely watching the turn of events, and asking, anxiously enough, whether justice will be done.

Of course, if the Prince is guilty of the charges made against him, if in a fit of insanity or in cold blood he armed his 200 Sepoys with ball cartridges, as the *Pioneer* alleges, with a view to intimidate Mr. Crosthwaite and the Political Agent, the sooner he is put out of harm's way the better. But it will never do for a couple of officials to decide such a matter. The Máhárája is entitled to a fair hearing and a judicial verdict. That is all that he asks for, and in the interests of justice and of the good government of India it is the least that can be done. What is there to be said on the other side? The Máhárája came to the throne in 1883—a youth of twenty. He was deprived almost at once of his full powers by the Political Agent, wisely, for all we know, princes of such tender years not always being infallible. But in 1894 his full powers were restored to him, and Mr. Urwin, the Political Agent, who left the district in March last year, gave a good record of the Prince, and his name was favourably mentioned in the last administrative report. In April, Captain Gordon arrived on the scene, the control being thus transferred from a civilian to a military man. Friction seems to have arisen in the summer between the two. No specific charges have been made public, but the misgovernment of the Máhárája must have been very bad indeed to warrant Captain Gordon's suggestion of deposition which was made last autumn. The Government hesitated to act upon the information in their possession; fresh charges were made by the Agent; in the end Mr. Crosthwaite was sent down; and immediately on his arrival the story of the ball cartridges and the Sepoys—the truth of which is entirely denied by the Prince—made its appearance. Now we express no opinion on the case. Captain Gordon may be justified up to the hilt in all he has done. He may have acted with tact and fairness, as well as decision, and the Máhárája may be a light-headed incapable. All we have to urge at the moment is that the case should be thoroughly sifted. If the Indian Government shirks the duty, then the India Office must keep them up to the mark. And if Lord George Hamilton fails, then Parliament must ask him for an explanation. Captain Gordon may be another Havelock, and this Prince a second Tippoo, but that is no reason for our behaving in a despotic and arbitrary way. Our

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

agents exercise absolute power over the Princes and peoples of India, and we must do our best to see that this power is not turned into a mere display of martial law.

Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P., gave notice, for February 24th, of the following question in the House of Commons :—

"To ask the Secretary of State for India, if his attention has been called to the charges brought by the political agent at Jhalwar against the Máhárája Rana of that State, accompanied with a recommendation to the Viceroy for his deposition; if so, what action has been taken by the Government of India with regard to these charges :

"Will His Highness have every opportunity afforded to him to defend himself publicly from these charges before any definite action is taken with regard to the recommendation for his deposition :

"And, will the Secretary of State lay upon the Table of the House any papers and correspondence relating to this difficulty in Jhalwar."

In reply to Mr. Roberts Lord G. Hamilton said :

"My answer to the first part of the first question is in the affirmative, and to the second part that the reports of the political agent as to the oppression existing have been examined on the spot by the newly-appointed agent to the Governor-General, whose report is under the consideration of Lord Elgin. The Máhárája will be allowed every opportunity of submitting his reply to these charges. As soon as I have received the final decision of the Viceroy I will consider if papers relating to this subject can be laid upon the Table of the House."

Mr. Roberts has also given notice of the following motion, for which no day has yet been fixed :—

"India (political resident at Jhalwar),—To call attention to the recent differences between the political resident at Jhalwar and the Máhárája Rana of that State; and to move, That, in the opinion of this House, the arrangements under which political residents are selected and appointed are unsatisfactory and require careful reconstruction."

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

MEMORANDUM ISSUED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Under the title "Memorandum on the Separation of Judicial from Executive (especially Police and Revenue) Duties in India," the British Committee of the Indian National Congress has just issued to Parliament, the Press, and others, a compilation of the authoritative statements which have lately appeared in our columns. The Memorandum, to which we refer in "Indiana," consists of sixteen foolscap pages, and opens with the following "Introductory Note," signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as Chairman of the British Committee :—

1. The present Memorandum owes its somewhat unusual form to the circumstances under which it has been drawn up. In November last the well-known Indian barrister, Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who was then staying in London, made an important statement to a representative of "INDIA" upon the injustice and dangers arising from the combination of Judicial and Executive functions in the same officers in India. Mr. Ghose's statement attracted the notice of Sir Richard Garth, who described it as thoroughly well considered and deserving of great respect, and suggested that it should be sent to every member of Parliament, both Lords and Commons. It is in order to carry out Sir Richard Garth's suggestion that the following documents have been brought together. They include, besides Mr. Ghose's statement and Sir Richard Garth's letter, brief expressions of sympathetic opinion by Lord Hobhouse, Sir Richard Couch, Sir John Phear, Sir R. T. Reid, Sir William Markby, and Sir Raymond West, together with a scheme, prepared in 1893 by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and approved by Sir Richard Garth, for carrying out the proposed reform. Mr. Dutt's scheme referred to Bengal, the Presidency, that is, into which it had been declared that the reform could not be introduced because it involved additional expenditure of prohibitive amount. Similar schemes for other Presidencies and Provinces had been framed, but it was understood that the most serious financial difficulty was apprehended in Bengal. Lord Dufferin was probably impressed with this opinion when, as Viceroy, he referred to the petition of the Indian National Congress for the Separation of Judicial and Executive functions as a "counsel of perfection" which the Government of India was, by the state of the finances at that time, prevented from accepting.

2. Mr. Manomohan Ghose's statement is reproduced here as it originally appeared, without omission, alteration, or addition. It deals, however, not only with the separation of Judicial and Executive functions, but also with the distinct, though collateral, question of the freedom of the Judiciary from pressure on the part of the Executive. It is the purpose of the present Memorandum to direct attention to the first of these questions—to the evils inseparable from a system under which the chief Executive official of a district collects the revenue, controls the police, institutes prosecutions, and at the same time exercises large and preponderating Judicial powers in the same district. Mr. Manomohan Ghose demonstrates the nature and gravity of these evils, and illustrates his statements by means of authentic examples drawn from his own experience.

3. The subject is not new. On the contrary, as Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt remarks, a Commission appointed to report on the police declared so long ago as 1860 that "judicial and police functions" ought not to be "mixed up and confounded," and the present system has not only been consistently condemned by high legal authorities, by Anglo-Indian officers of all parties, and by independent public opinion in India, but has also provoked the censure of two successive Secretaries of State, Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley. The only semblance of argument against a reform demanded by such a chorus of voices and with such unanswerable force, is the allegation that it would be too costly. If this theory is still held in any quarter, it is disposed of, at once and for all, by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, who shows in detail, and with the authority of experience in the several offices concerned, that the reform might be accomplished without any addition

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to expenditure. Even if Mr. Dutt's statements were not regarded as conclusive, a practical experiment might at least be made in a single Division, where the "counsel of perfection" could be adopted without risking any considerable increase of expenditure.

THE SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

NINTH SESSION.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

We give below the text of the resolutions carried at the Ninth Session of the Indian Social Conference, which met at Poona last December :—

I.—EXTENSION OF FEMALE EDUCATION.

RAO BAHADUR LALSHUNKER, of Ahmedabad, moved that, while expressing its satisfaction with the efforts that had been made by various private societies and Samajas in Calcutta, Bombay, Poona, Ahmedabad, Jalandhar, and other cities, and by the native States of Baroda and Mysore, for the promotion of higher female education, either by the establishment of high schools, or by opening home classes or giving lectures to grown-up ladies, or by holding periodical examinations for awarding prizes to those who studied at home, this Conference still considered that further organised efforts must be made to secure a wider extension of female education, as regards the numbers of scholars attending and the standards taught in primary and secondary schools, so as to bring it to the level of the education of boys; and the Conference recommended that all social reform associations in the country should recognise the claims of this reform upon their attention, and endeavour to the best of their power to secure the support of private and public funds for such extension.

II.—TEMPERANCE IN INDIA.

Professor ABAJI VISHNU KATHWATE proposed the second resolution, declaring that the Conference noted with pleasure that—thanks to the noble efforts made by Mr. W. S. Caine, Rev. Mr. Evans, and their native fellow-workers—considerable success had attended the efforts of the Kayastha Temperance Society and similar other organisations for the promotion of total abstinence, and it felt more than ever the necessity of active co-operation between the temperance movements in India, and in England and America. The vice was not of ancient growth here, and was still confined to minorities; and it was in the opinion of the Conference necessary that the majority of total abstainers should exert themselves to popularise their views, and to obtain the power of enforcing them by some adaptation of the principle of local option, which could not be secured without the co-operation of the English and American temperance societies.

III.—THE ANTI-NAUTCH MOVEMENT.

Mr. RAMANBHAI, of Ahmedabad, moved that the Conference recorded its satisfaction that the *anti-nautch* movement had found such general support in all parts of India, and recommended the various social reform associations in the country to persevere in the adoption of this self-denying ordinance, and to supplement it by pledging their members to adhere to the cardinal principle of observing on all occasions as a religious duty purity of thought, speech, and action, so as to purge their society generally of the evils of low and immoral surroundings.

IV.—MUHAMMADANS AND HINDUS.

Mr. ALI MAHOMED BHIMJI proposed the fourth resolution, which set forth that, while it was a matter of general satisfaction that the relations between the Hindus and Muhammadans in the North-West Provinces and Oudh had assumed their normal character of mutual help and toleration, the Conference regretted that their relations had not been equally satisfactory in some parts of the Presidency of Bombay and the Puujab, and there had been unfortunate misunderstandings between the Hindus and the native Christians, in one or two places in the Madras Presidency. The Conference recommended to all social reform associations that it was their first duty to cultivate friendly relations with the professors of all creeds, and they should lend their active support to the efforts made by the Government to establish a better understanding between all classes, by pressing for the creation of mixed conciliation boards to settle misunderstandings before they broke out in open violence.

V.—RE-ADMISSION TO CASTE.

Mr. D. G. GARUD moved that the Conference noted with satisfaction that there now existed no difficulty in the admission of foreign-travelled people among the Khatri and Shikh communities of the Punjab, and that the admission of similar people in Guzerat and Southern India had been secured during the present year on more easy conditions than were possible some years ago. The Conference recommended these examples to the Kayastha community in the north-western provinces, where more difficulty had been experienced, and to the Brahmans and other high castes in all parts of the country among whom the prejudice against foreign travel by sea was still strong. The earnest co-operation of the caste and ecclesiastical leaders must be enlisted in this work, as the final success of all the political, industrial, and social activities rested on this movement.

VI.—INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN SUB-CASTES.

On the motion of Mr. GOVIND BAPUJEE JOSHI, it was resolved that "the Conference notes with pleasure that the reports of some of the associations display very praiseworthy efforts in some places to bring about intercommunion between the members of sub-castes or subdivisions. Unless some such fusion is encouraged in all the smaller castes, no practical reform even as regards marriage customs as existing in some of the castes is permanently possible; and it is on this and other accounts that the Conference recommends all social reform associations to direct their efforts to secure the reunion of the smaller divisions."

VII.—MARRIAGE CUSTOMS AND LAWS.

PUNDIT MALVIYA proposed the seventh resolution,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

as follows:—"The Conference notes with pleasure that the very earnest efforts made in some of the highest Brahman families to raise the marriageable age of girls and boys in the Maharashtra country, and in some other parts of Northern India, have been attended with considerable success, and the weakness of the opposition made leads to the hope that further persistence in this direction will soon raise the tone of the national sentiment on this question, so as to secure a return to the old traditions of Vedic and Epic times. (*b*) The Conference further expresses its satisfaction that the marriage laws passed by his Highness the late Máhárája have worked well in Mysore, and the fact that the breaches of the the law were brought to the notice of the authorities by neigbours encourages the hope that public sentiment is slowly rousing itself to the evils of this custom. (*c*) The action of the ecclesiastical head Acharya in Maharastra, in solemnly condemning the practice of the sale of girls, is a matter which sug-suggests the hope that the time has now come when this evil custom, so opposed to all old traditions and sense of human dignity, will be discountenanced by all classes of the community and fall into disuse. (*d*) It is also a matter of great satisfaction that the Governments of Bengal, North-Western Provinces, and the Punjab have interested themselves in the discouragement of extravagant expenditure in marriage and death ceremonies. The various caste organisations have anticipated such action in many places, and it may be hoped that these communities, helped by Government, will soon be enabled to enforce their regulations upon their own recalcitrant members without hitch or danger of schism."

VIII.—Re-marriage of Widows.

Rao Bahadur Gunpatrao Manker moved the eighth resolution, as follows: "The Conference expresses its satisfaction that this year, as in the two or three years past, some ten marriages of widows have taken place—five in the Presidency of Bombay, one in Madras, and four in the Punjab; and it congratulates Devan Santrama, of Lahore, on the moral courage shown by him in this connection. The Conference hopes that in Bengal, where the movement had its first origin, and the misery of child-widows is enhanced by Koolin polygamy, special efforts will be made to honour the memory of the late Pandit Vidyasagar, by supporting the movement dear to his heart. As long as the miserable condition of the child-widow fails to move the people, there can be no happy home in the land; and the Conference accordingly recommends all the social reform associations to support this cause by their active sympathy and personal help."

IX.—Disfigurement of Child-Widows.

Mr. K. Nalarayan, editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, proposed the ninth resolution: "The practice of disfigurement in the case of child-widows is an enormity which must be put down by strenuous private efforts in all places, and the widows be educated, and thus taught to help themselves, and earn their own livelihood, and be helpful to those with whom their lot is cast by reason of their misfortune."

X.—Condition of the Pariahs.

It was resolved "that the Conference notes with satisfaction that, in the Madras Presidency, the attention of Government and the public has been forcibly drawn to the condition of the Pariah caste, who, by reason of their neglect by caste-Hindus, are tempted to give up their faith, and become converts to other creeds. The education and social amelioration of these out-castes, in all parts of India, is a duty which devolves upon all those who have the permanent good of their country at heart, and every effort should be made to raise these classes to a position where, by education and industry, they may rise above the disadvantages of their condition."

XI.—Admission of Converts into Hindu Society.

Mr. Sevaklal Kursondas, addressing the assembly in Hindustani, proposed "that the Conference welcomes the efforts made in the Central Provinces, Madras, and the Punjab to admit into Hindu society converts to other religion, and the Conference hopes that the people everywhere will try to follow in the same footsteps."

XII.—Restitution of Conjugal Rights.

Rao Bahadur Bhat moved that the Conference recorded its regret that the Supreme Legislative Council abandoned, in Committee, the proposal to give discretionary power to the Judges to enforce restitution of conjugal rights by imprisonment, and rejected even the modified motion brought by the Hon. Mr. Mehta on the subject. The Conference hoped that the subject would soon engage the attention of Government, so as to remedy the evil which had been partly created by its own enactments.

Reviews.

THE STORY OF THE DECCAN.

A History of the Deccan. By J. D. B. Gribble. In 2 vols. With Portraits, Maps, Plates, and Illustrations. Vol. I. (London: Luzac and Co.)

Mr. Gribble has done good historical service in gathering and piecing together a great variety of materials into a continuous history of the Deccan. He disclaims originality, and boldly announces that he has helped himself without a scruple to everything that promised to be useful for his purpose, find it wherever he might. He has made free with Elliott and Dawson, and he has gleaned much excellent and interesting material from the Bombay Gazetteers of the various Deccan districts. For a most interesting episode of Bijapur history he has laid under contribution Colonel Meadows Taylor's fine historical romance, "A Noble Queen." The only objection that the reader is likely to raise is, that Mr. Gribble has not always succeeded in fitting his materials together in a very artistic style. The dovetailing is somewhat rough. Better that, however, than lack of the materials. Perhaps, too, some blame must rest upon the fact that the author did not have an opportunity of putting the finishing touches to his proofs. There are many blunders throughout the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

volume, which indicate that Mr. Gribble's own eyes did not see his book through the press. This is a pity, especially in a really handsome volume, although it does not detract from the essential value of the narrative. After all, the printing is very creditable—for Amsterdam. When Mr. Gribble has published his second volume he will fairly be regarded as having performed for the Deccan the literary service that Tod, Wilks, and Grant Duff performed so ably for Rajputana, Mysore, and the Mahrattas. His work is a welcome reclamation of another large and important tract of historical jungle.

Mr. Gribble proposes to trace the history of the Deccan from the commencement of the fourteenth century down to the establishment of the present dynasty—a period of four centuries, full of blood and struggle, full also of the most interesting and romantic episodes. The present volume covers some three-quarters of the period. The first division deals mainly with the House of Bahmani and the rise of the kingdom of Vijayanagar. The second is chiefly concerned with the history of Bijapur, and with the fall of Vijayanagar and Golconda. The third contemplates the empire in ruins, and the rise of a new kingdom from the *débris*. "Beyond the Khyber Pass began to loom the shadow of the Persian conqueror, and in Maharashtra a nation had been formed that was to make a bid for the empire. It did so, and failed; and in the meanwhile in the west and the east and the north-east the small clouds of British power, at the time scarcely bigger than a man's hand, gradually increased in size, until a few years later the English were called in, first as the aids, and then as the arbiters, of the Muhammadan emperors." The whole story, if often gruesome and repulsive, is also often picturesque, and always eminently instructive.

"Indian history," says Mr. Gribble, "is for the most part a record of daring adventurers, who gain power and sometimes the throne by a series of crimes, and utilise it for purposes of extortion, tyranny and and oppression." The generalisation is amply supported by the history of the Deccan, notwithstanding occasional contrasts of the most remarkable kind, such as the Sultan Alla-ud-Din and Asaf Jah, at the beginning and the end of the present volume. The story commences with the destruction of the Hindu kingdoms of Warangal and Deogiri, and the plundering incursions of the Muhammadan armies far away to the south; while the Hindus, driven from Warangal and the Telingana, have founded a new kingdom at Vijayanagar, destined to prove for two centuries and a half a bulwark against further invasion. The lunacies of Mahomed Tughlak Shah (Mr. Gribble is made to spell his name half-a-dozen different ways) are outdone in interest by the remarkable story of Hassan, a field labourer for the first thirty years of his life, who eventually founded the dynasty of Bahmani, ascending the throne of the Deccan in 1347 as Sultan Alla-ud-Din.

"There are, unfortunately, but very slight materials for a history of the Sultan Alla-ud-Din, but those that exist are sufficent to show that he deserves a high place amongst the great men of the world's history. Born in the lowest ranks, he rose, by his own honesty of character, to be the founder of a great kingdom, and at no time was his career stained by cruelty or injustice. There are few characters in history that can compare with this, the first King of the Deccan, and there is probably no other nation in the world than the Muhammadan which can furnish the example of a peasant raising himself to the throne of a monarch, who retains throughout his career not only dignity of character, but honesty of purpose, and who relinquishes life with such humble piety and simplicity. Muhammadans of the Deccan may well be proud of the first founder of their rule."

A pretty good case might, indeed, be made out in favour of a Roman emperor or two on much the same lines—say, Diocletian, or Justin, or Justinian. Still it is pleasant to meet with such a man as Alla-ud-Din in such circumstances, and Mr. Gribble's praise of him must not be grudged. He was much the best of his house, of the Gulburga and Bieder sultans, though it is agreeable to find a son of his, Mahmood Shah (1378-96) "in the habit of saying that kings were only trustees of the divine riches, and that to expend more than was absolutely necessary was a breach of trust." It would be a singularly happy thing for India if this principle of Mahmood's prevailed in its governing counsels five hundred years after his time. Mahmood was the fifth of the Gulburga sultans, and appears to have laid to heart the wisdom of his father. During his reign great care appears to have been bestowed on education, schools being established in the principal towns; and much consideration seems to have been shown to the poor people. In the reign of Feroze Shah, the eighth sultan (1396-1422), there is a remarkable episode, the story of the lovely Pertal, daughter of a Hindu farmer, for whose sake the Sultan Feroze and the King of Vijayanagar warred on each other—the King of Vijayanagar, by the way, having some 12,000 wives already. In the reign of Muhammed Shah (1462-82) there comes into prominence another personage with a very romantic history. This was Yusuf Adil Khan. Yusuf was born in 1443, son of Murad, the Sultan of Turkey. On the death of Murad in 1450, Yusuf was threatened with the bow-string, but was saved by the address of his mother, who had him committed to the care of a slave-dealer, who carried him off to Persia, whence he made his way to Ahmedabad Bieder. There, by his personal qualities, he steadily rose until eventually he founded "another dynasty, which was to supplant the house of Bahmani and rule with splendour in the Deccan for nearly two hundred years, until at last conquered by the all-powerful Aurungzebe. This new dynasty was the Adil Shahi house of Bijapur."

Yusuf Adil Shah was eminently worthy of his success. He was a great soldier and statesman, "handsome in person," says Ferishta, "eloquent of speech, and eminent for his learning, liberality, and valour." His strong position is indicated by his daring to change the religion of his State from the Sunni to the Shiah creed; and his breadth of mind is shown by his tolerant proclamation to his subjects. "My faith for myself, and your faith, for yourselves." His private character, too, was temperate and virtuous; he had but one wife, a Hindoo lady. The most striking figure, however, in the history of the Adil Shahi dynasty is not named in the list of Sultans. That figure is Queen Chand, the wife and widow of Ali Adil (1257-79), the fifth in the line. She is Colonel Meadows Taylor's "Noble Queen,"

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and his description of her may be well repeated here:

"Few in England know that the contemporary of our Queen Elizabeth in the Deccan kingdoms was a woman of equal abilty, of equal political talent, of equal, though in a different sense, education and accomplishments, who ruled over a realm as large, a population as large, and as intelligent, and as rich, as England; a woman who, surrounded by jealous enemies, preserved by her own personal valour and endurance her kingdom from destruction and partition; who, through all temptations and exercise of absolute power, was at once simple, generous, frank, and merciful, as she was chaste, virtuous, religious, and charitable—one who, among all the women of India, stands out as a jewel without flaw and beyond price."

Mr. Gribble narrates how Queen Chand, who was the sister of the Ahmednagar Sultan, accompanied her husband in his campaigns and rode by his side to battle; how, in times of peace, she had a large portion of the public affairs entrusted to her, and gave audiences and transacted business in open durbar; and how she was beloved by all, not only for her daring, but also for her justice and firmness. When Prince Murad, Akbar's son, came down on Ahmednagar with 30,000 men, Queen Chand, then nearly fifty years of age, responded to the call to undertake the Regency and the defence of the State. A breach being suddenly made in the walls, "several of the leading officers of the garrison prepared for flight."

"But Chand Bibi, clad in armour, and with a veil thrown over her face, and with a drawn sword in her hand, dashed forward to defend the breach. The fugitives to a man returned and joined her, and as the storming party held back for the other mines, the besieged had time to throw rockets, powder, and other combustibles into the ditch, and to bring guns to bear upon the breach. From the early morning until sundown, the heroic Queen remained in the breach, encouraging her soldiers and endeavouring to repair the damage. For some reason or other, the general assault was delayed until the afternoon, by which time the defenders were better prepared to resist it, but from about two o'clock until sunset force after force of Moguls was hurled against the breach to be each time repulsed, until the moat was filled with the bodies of the slain. Throughout the whole of this desperate attack, Queen Chand was foremost amongst the defenders. Her green veil was seen everywhere, and her voice was heard, calling out in its shrill treble her late husband's battle cry."

The attack failed, and the siege was raised. But in another siege, in 1599, Chand Bibi was cut down and died, "one of the noblest characters in the history of India." The Moguls now got firm footing in the Deccan, and the beginning of the end had commenced.

One more episode:—

"In the same year as Ahmednagar fell, an incident occurred which was destined to have a most important effect upon Indian history. During the Holi festival of that year (March-April), a Maratha named Majoli Bhonsla, who commanded a small body of Silleedar horse, took his son Shahji, a boy of five, to pay his respects to his commanding officer, Lukhji Jadhavrao. Lukhji's little daughter, Jiji, a child of three, was present, and, whilst the elders were talking, the two children began to play together. Lukhji asked his daughter, in joke: 'How would you like that boy for your husband?' and, on the girl saying 'Yes,' Majoli at once rose and called the guests to witness that Lukhji had offered his daughter in marriage to his son Shahji, which offer he, as Shahji's father, accepted. Taken thus at his word, Lukhji and his wife were exceedingly angry, but Majoli remained unshaken, and eventually (1604) the marriage really took place. The issue of this marriage was the great Sivaji, the founder of the Maratha nation."

We have dwelt mainly on the picturesque side of the history; but not only the political developments, but also the moral and material condition of the country will be found to be carefully traced and illustrated. The maps, portraits, and other illustrations add much to the value of the work. We shall look forward with interest to the appearance of the second volume.

"THE VALLEY OF KASHMIR."

The Valley of Kashmir. By WALTER R. LAWRENCE, I.C.S., C.I.E., Settlement Commissioner, Kashmir and Jammu State. (Oxford University Press, 1895.)

The latest of the handsome publications on Indian matters from the Clarendon Press is the result and record of six years' work in Kashmir. The present settlement was commenced in 1887 by Mr. Wingate, who was succeeded by Mr. Lawrence in 1889, and the arrangements made under their guidance were finally confirmed in 1893. A comparison of the old administration and the new settlement would, under the guidance of Mr. Lawrence, lead us to the conclusion that Englishmen in general were archangels, and that the Political Department of the Government of India were gods. The truth is, unhappily, somewhat different. Everybody knows that there is another side to the picture painted by Mr. Lawrence, and those who remember the late Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches, and have read "Condemned Unheard," will take a due discount off Mr. Lawrence's inspired and *ex parte* statement of the political question. The picture which he presents of the unreformed, un-Anglicised Kashmir is black enough. The history of the State was, we are led to believe, a history of centuries of extortion and oppression. Taxation had steadily risen until it amounted to no less than three-fourths of the produce of the land, and although the proportion was reduced in 1860 to little more than half, this improvement was more than compensated by the wasteful methods of collection. Unjust assessments, the farming of taxes, and the embezzlement of sums which were entered as arrears against the various districts combined to bring about such a position of affairs that, while the revenue steadily rose on paper, it no less steadily declined in fact. Cultivators abandoned their holdings, and would have left the valley, had not the laws forbidden. Many of them went to swell the huge pauper population of the capital and to feed on the corn supplied there at State prices—a provision which is one of the most curious institutions of Srinagar. From time immemorial the villagers had been looked upon as inferior to the urban population, and in the interest of the latter payment of revenue in grain valued much below the market rate was customary, and the sale of produce by the cultivator prohibited. Collectors, boatmen and officials of all classes plundered and adulterated the grain, and lent their support to the maintenance of an oppressive system. The difficulties of transport in Kashmir produced another grievance, a system of *corvée* for the provision of carriers. But the Government of India has changed all this. A complete survey has been made, together with a new and equitable assessment, holders of land have been confirmed in their possessions, with hereditary right of occupancy, but without the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

power to alienate land either by sale or mortgage. Cultivators have returned to their farms, and it has been found possible to repeal the prohibition of emigration; the *corvée* has been limited, and by the construction of a road to Gilghit its necessity is in great part obviated. The fictitious arrears of revenue have been remitted, the host of petty officials who took toll of all revenue is rapidly disappearing, and payment in kind with all its concomitant evils has been reduced to the actual limits imposed by the necessity of feeding the real poor of Srinagar, the remnants of the once flourishing shawl-weavers. And so the *couleur de rose* continues. With the support of the Máhárája and his Council, Mr. Lawrence has effected a social revolution. While the burden on the people has been lightened, the net revenue has been increased to such an extent that the cost of the settlement will be recouped within two years. Such is the impression conveyed by Mr. Lawrence. The transformation is as beneficent as it is complete. But it is really "all too bright and good for human nature's daily food." We will not, at this moment, dwell upon the other side of the picture, nor enquire how far the blame, under the old system, was due solely to the Máhárája, and how far the praise, under the new system, is due solely to the Government of India. The true history of Kashmir has yet to be written. Meantime, the question that Mr. Lawrence's narrative suggests is whether such improvements as have been made could not have been made equally well without the introduction of an exotic system, and certainly without the use of methods which, we fear, are only too acceptable to a certain *coterie* in the Government of India. English readers of this part of Mr. Lawrence's book should, in fairness, read "Condemned Unheard" as well.

Mr. Lawrence's survey of the history of Kashmir occupies, however, a comparatively small portion of the volume, which was "written for the State administration with the object of recording the statistics and resources of the valley." A mass of important information and figures bearing on religions, races, industries, flora, fauna, geology, agriculture, etc., attest the care and thoroughness of the survey, while the excellent chapters on archæology, scenery, and social life indicate the zest with which Mr. Lawrence undertook his task, in addition to providing a large amount of delightful pabulum for the purely general reader. Much has been written on Kashmir since Bernier visited the country in 1664 and wrote his account of "Cachemire, the Paradise of the Indies," and we have imbibed many notions of the wealth and splendour of the country from our early acquaintance with fairy tales anent beautiful princesses of Cachemire. But even examined in the dry light of official statistics and reports the country remains one of unsurpassed beauty and interest, and the people, though exhibiting in their character the effects of an unenviable history, are still entertaining and companionable. Originally a vast lake surrounded by towns, the ruins of which high up on the hills marked the original level of the water, the valley of Kashmir was laid bare when the water found an outlet at Baramula. The absence of easy means of egress and intercourse with the outer world has had its natural effect on the native population. The bulk of the traffic is carried on the Jehelum by boats which drift at the rate of a mile and a half an hour, a speed which is accepted as a kind of standard for the regulation of domestic matters in general. Consequently time is of no importance to the Kashmiri. Like other people of much leisure he is not over particular in the matter of cleanliness, but insists on warmth. In winter his sheep are penned in the ground floor of the house that they may warm the living room above; he also wears under his long robe an earthenware pot in a wicker case filled with hot embers to keep him warm. On the other hand he has no furniture and is content with a wash once in ten days. He is not without humour. A villager, who complained to Mr. Lawrence that his uncle had turned him out naked, received a present of European clothing, with the advice to behave like a European now that he was clothed as one. Next day the uncle came to complain, bearing on his person the marks of a severe castigation. Something too may be hoped from a man who will paddle till he drops rather than let a rival boatman pass him, and who takes kindly to cricket. When we remember how large a part in his history has been played by fire, famine, flood, and earthquake; how often cholera has swept the valley; and how small-pox, by its repeated devastations, has raised unto itself a deity to be propitiated and a ceremonial to be observed; we shall feel more kindly disposed towards his superstition and selfishness; with his history before us, we shall make allowances for his deficiency in truthfulness. Mr. Lawrence, of course, endorses the opinion that good government will reform the native population completely, and careful administration is already doing something to stamp out fire, famine, flood, and epidemic. Even with all its existing disadvantages, a country in which the traveller can find beautiful scenery, and, by regulating the altitude of his abode, can enjoy the climate which suits him best; where even the dirty towns are undeniably picturesque; where the archæologist can find ruined temples that furnish opportunities for endless speculation on the eastward advance of Greek influence in art; where the sportsman can find the fullest gratification of his tastes; and where one of the highest ambitions of the prince is to render hospitality and assistance to all who travel in his domains—such a country must have

Insect Bites or Stings, Chafed Skin, Piles, Cuts, Sore Eyes, Sunburn, Earache, Neuralgic and Rheumatic Pains, Throat Colds, and Skin Ailments, Quickly Relieved by use of

CALVERT'S
CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT and CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

many attractions for European visitors. The first impulse that follows the reading of the volume before us suggests the enquiry, How do the trains run to Jammu?

The work is enriched by seventeen photographic plates, a map, and several charts; it is well indexed; and perfect letterpress, paper, and binding make a handsome book, worthy, so far as production is concerned, of the best traditions of the Clarendon Press.

MR. HAROLD SPENDER'S STORY.

At the Sign of the Guillotine. By HAROLD SPENDER (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Mr. Spender has resorted to a fashion now much in vogue among a certain class of novelists, and sought his plot among the pages of French history. The scene of his novel opens at the time of the Revolution, when Robespierre was at the height of triumphant dictatorship, and practically ends with his fall. Dealing with public life in Paris at the time the book affords interesting portraits of such men as St. Just, Couthon, and Robespierre himself. The main outlines of the plot may be sketched as follows. The Deputy Bertrand Louvier, who has been absent from Paris on political business, returns to find that the Revolution, which he had hoped would secure prosperty and happiness to his native land, has plunged it into misery. He has for some years been attached to Elise Duplay, a girl who, like himself, belongs to the *bourgeois* class. Shortly after his arrival in Paris he becomes betrothed to her. The news reaches the ears of Robespierre, who lodges with the Duplays, and who has long cherished a secret attachment to Elise. He imprisons Louvier and releases him only after Elise has promised to marry himself. Thenceforward, the object of Louvier's life is to destroy his unscrupulous rival, and he becomes the leading spirit in the plots which ultimately bring the tyrant to the guillotine. When Robespierre has been removed from the path of the lovers, we recognise that the position has changed. Louvier is no longer a noble patriot, but an embittered man, who has poisoned his own soul in pursuit of revenge. He falls a victim to disease, and in his last moments consigns Elise to the care of De Saens, a somewhat philosophical nobleman who discharges the trust by marrying her and living in retirement for the rest of his life. Though the interest of the story is well maintained, this conclusion seems to us rather weak. Elise is perhaps the least satisfactory character in the book. That, in the last straits, to save her lover's life, she should consent to be betrothed to Robespierre, is admissible. That she should endure the position thus forced upon her for more than a year, during which her sentiments changed from esteem to abhorrence, is possible. But that she should afterwards calmly accept De Saens is, at least, unromantic. The Marquis de Saens is a man whom experience has gone far to make a cynic. He offers a striking contrast and analogy to Louvier. Both are in early manhood ardent Republicans, though severed so far in position, and both shrink in horror from the excesses perpetrated in the name of liberty. The Marquis describes his own feelings in the words: "I still hoped that good men would have courage to punish the miscreants, and to develope the good side of the Revolution. Nothing was done. I found myself in danger of perishing stupidly and causelessly, just mangled to death with a playful stroke of the great Revolutionary animal. At that I confess I determined to go. I left a France insane. I will go back to her when she has recovered her sanity." De Saens was in fact a man who had been compelled to part with the dream of his youth. But there seems to be no reason why he and Elise should be united on the strength of a common disappointment. Considerable liberty has of course been taken with some of the historical characters. Duplay, weak-minded and pompous as he appears, is yet an amiable representation of the bloodthirsty juryman of history. Robespierre, though the chief traits in his character, his personal vanity, cruelty and cowardice, are clearly shown, is nevertheless depicted as a man whose private life was altogether inestimable. Actual facts in such a case are too repulsive. Finally, we congratulate Mr. Spender on his first novel, in the confident belief that the promise he displays as a writer will bring him greater success in the future, and that his power of delineating character will be not less conspicuous on a canvass where he has a freer hand.

THAT invaluable handbook, *Whitaker's Almanack*, makes its twenty-ninth appearance and shows no decline from the excellence that characterised it under the editorship of its late founder, whose name has become a household word. *Whitaker* is the veritable *multum in parvo* of the commercial world and of the general reader. Its pages may be consulted for something about every thing, though not, perhaps, for every thing about any thing. The chapter on "The British Empire in India," for example, consists of some 26 pages of closely printed matter, and is a marvel of condensation. But it is unfortunate that the compiler of facts about Chitral forgets that the policy of occupation is a breach of faith. This summary bears the true official stamp. Criticism is, of course, out of the question in a book of reference, but a bare statement of the facts would have revealed the truth. We read *Whitaker*, but does *Whitaker* read INDIA?

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

GENTLEMEN'S MAGAZINE. Reid, D. N., "Reminiscences of a Behar Planter."

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Holditch, Col. T. H., "The Origin of the Kafir of the Hindu Kush."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street. S.W.). "The Social Conference at Poona." Dhingra, B.L., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., "Medical Aid to Indian Women."

RELIGIOUS REVIEW OF REVIEWS. Meakin, J. E. Budgett, "The Beliefs of a Burmese Buddhist Monk."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1896.

GRINNELL, GEORGE BIRD..... "The Story of the Indian." (Chapman and Hall.) .... 6s. 0d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.

583. (LEGAL.) INDIA: ORDER IN COUNCIL. Approving an Alteration in the Scheme for the Permanent Establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council ..... 0s. 1d.

Printed by A. RONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 1. (NEW SERIES.) APRIL, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	97
The Enigma of "Loss by Exchange," by Sir J. B. Phear	102
Looking Backwards—I, by A. O. Hume, C.B.	104
Land Revenue Assessment in Madras, by Alexander Rogers	105
The Abolition of Trial by Jury, by A. Nundy	107
English Ignorance of India, by an Independent Politician	109
"All Members for India"!	110
The Judiciary and the Executive	112
The Real Motive Power	113
Congress Addresses	115
Buddhist Lore	117
The Invasion of Kafiristan	118
The Cotton Duties	119
The Scope of the "Mandate"	121
Our London Letter	123
The Indian Budget	124
Simultaneous Examinations	126
Resolutions of the Poona Congress	126
Reviews: Charles Bradlaugh	126
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	128

Indiana.

The Indian Budget.

Sir James Westland presented in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General on March 18th his financial statement for 1896-7. We print elsewhere the brief telegraphic summary which was sent, according to custom, to the Secretary of State. The details of the Budget will be more properly criticised when we have before us the full text of Sir J. Westland's statement, and the report of the debate in the Legislative Council. Meantime, however, there are one or two points which obviously call for notice. The financial statement "begins," we are told,

"by announcing the restoration of the Famine Insurance Grant, with effect from the date of its suspension. The amount will, however, for the present be taken at Rx. 1,000,000 instead of Rx. 1,500,000, this amount being considered, on a review of fifteen years' transactions, to make sufficient provision for present needs."

"Restoration" is rather good—after the reiterated assertions of the Government of India during recent years that there was no such thing as a Famine Insurance Fund, and that any contributions which it might be handsome enough to make to famine insurance must be produced by a surplus. We venture to congratulate the Government of India upon admitting, however tardily, the force of the criticisms consistently urged by the Indian National Congress and in these columns. That "restoration" is the right word is conclusively shown by the history of the Famine Insurance Fund. Those who wish to look closely into the subject may consult INDIA for July, 1894 (p. 218). Here we may note the terms employed by Sir John Strachey when he presented his Financial Statement in 1877 and explained the new taxation for famine insurance:

"I hope," he said, "that no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, will tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust."

Similarly, Lord Lytton, in his Minute of March 12th, 1878, recorded on behalf of the Government of India, the following pledge:—

"To apply sums from the surplus revenues at the rate of 1½ millions sterling per annum in such a manner as to create what shall be, in fact, an insurance fund, from which future expenditure for famine relief can be provided for without adding to the permanent burden of the revenues."

Yet these sums have not been applied. On the contrary, the "sacred trust" has been neglected, though not for any administrative improvement nor for any fiscal reform. It is military expenditure, especially in Burma and beyond the North-west frontier, that has played havoc with the Famine Insurance Fund. Even the "restoration" is only at the rate of Rx.1,000,000 instead of (not Rx.1,500,000 as Sir J. Westland appears oddly to have suggested, but) "1½ million sterling"—a very different thing. Still, it is something for the Government of India to resolve to do right by halves.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The Cost of Aggression.

The grim wolf of military aggression has, as Sir James Westland's statement shows, devoured no small amount of the revenues of India during the past year, and its privy paw is upon the new Budget. The charges for the Chitral expedition are stated in the revised estimate for 1895-96 at Rx. 1,750,000 + £16,000 sterling. This sum contrasts rather painfully with the original estimate of Rx. 150,000, and and there is, of course, more to follow. Mr. Balfour, to be sure, said in his airy way at Glasgow last November that the expense of the Chitral operation was "absoluely insignificant." He was thinking, no doubt, of that egregious estimate of Rx. 150,000. He added that the retention of Chitral would not involve the "augmentation of the Indian army" by one single soldier. If that is so, the Indian army must have been too large before. But Lord Salisbury has reminded us to beware of the estimates of statesmen for projects upon which they have set their hearts. Besides, if the retention of Chitral was, as Mr. Balfour argued, dictated by the "prestige" of the British Empire, why should India pay the whole of the bill? The new Budget sets apart Rx. 495,000 for mobilization, "a large programme of railway capital expenditure is laid down," and it is announced that "a rupee loan of four crores will be raised in India." These items, among others, will need close scrutiny. As for the surplus, the only thing that is yet certain about it is that we must not thank the Government of India for it, as the following figures show:—

Surplus (as advertised).....	Rx. 693,000
Unexpected saving on Exchange	Rx. 1,436,000
	Rx. 743,000

In other words, if it had not been for the windfall from unexpected improvement in Exchange, it looks as if the Government of India would have produced a deficit of Rx. 743,000. As the Government estimated not for equilibrium but for a surplus of Rx. 991,000, this is rather a large order. The Budget estimate for military expenditure is 24 crores 29 lakhs. "It is remarked," says the correspondent of the *Times*, "that military expenditure in India continues to increase." It does indeed.

"Of their own accord."

We wrote last month, with reference to the optimism of the Queen's Speech and of Lord George Hamilton, that we had not done with Chitral yet. The Queen's Speech said that "the engagements entered into by the border tribes for the maintenance and protection of the road from Peshawar" had been "carried out without molestation or disturbance." As for Lord George Hamilton's statement, we cannot do better than place it by the side of the more cautious, and certainly not less well informed, opinion of the *Pioneer*:—

LORD G. HAMILTON.
February 17th.

"The Government had succeeded in making an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral, and the tribes through whose territory it had passed had of their own accord undertaken to protect it."

THE "PIONEER."
January 30th.

"By next June we shall know whether the peace that has reigned since the Field Force was withdrawn is illusory or not."

But that is not all, nor the worst. The *Pioneer* of February 20th publishes an article "calculating the chances of disturbances when the Chitral Reliefs are being carried out." The writer reflects with satisfaction, not that the tribesmen are friendly, but that "there will be a considerable force along the line of communications" and that "the tribesmen will have no temptation to attack small detachments." The regiments are to "join hands," and "if trouble threatens" General Waterfield will have "a very useful force, composed of a mountain battery, two squadrons of cavalry, and six regiments of infantry under his orders." These prudential measures contrast strangely with Lord G. Hamilton's sanguine statements in the House of Commons, which were as follows:—

"There had been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regarded the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political officer, asking to be incorporated in British territory. They said they had felt such advantage and sense of security from the presence of the troops, and no doubt from the better prices they got for their produce, that they thought they would like to have these benefits permanently. They were told it was impossible they could be so incorporated."

So greatly did the indigenous tribes appreciate the "advantages" and the "benefits" of invasion that our troops, on passing through their territory, anticipate a reception of excessive warmth. The *Pioneer* thinks that there may not, after all, be any disturbances. Why not? Because of the friendliness of the tribes, and their appreciation of the "advantages" and "benefits" aforesaid? Not a bit of it—but because

"Major Deane, Political Officer, has the tribesmen well in hand; and even the fanatical sections must recognise that it would be foolish in the extreme to show their teeth when more troops than usual would be on the line of communication."

Yet these are our very humble and obedient servants who "had of their own accord undertaken to protect" the road. Poor Lord George Hamilton!

The Indian Parliamentary Committee.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, which was formed in July, 1893, has received a considerable accession of strength from the new members of the House of Commons. A circular letter, containing a brief statement of the origin and aims of the Com-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

mittee, was sent by Sir W. Wedderburn on March 19th, to a selected number of new members, with an invitation that they should join it. The response has, so far, been highly satisfactory, as the following list of gentlemen who have intimated their willingness to become members of the Committee shows:

Ashton, T. G.	Lambert, G.
Bainbridge, E.	Langley, Batty.
Brigg, J.	Leuty, T. R.
Burt, T.	McKenna, R.
Caldwell, J.	Macleod, J.
Cawley, F. W.	Morgan, J. Lloyd.
Colville, J.	Robson, W. S.
Davies, M. Vaughan.	Samuel, J.
Goddard, D. F.	Scott, C. P.
Gold, C.	Souttar, R.
Gourley, Sir E. T.	Ure, A.
Harwood, G.	Wayman, T.
Hazell, W.	White, J. M.
Holborn, J. G.	Williams, J. Carvell.
Horniman, J. F.	Wilson, F. W.
Jacoby, J. A.	Yoxall, J. H.
Jones, W.	

The Indian Parliamentary Committee is now more than a hundred strong, and cannot fail to exercise a highly important influence upon Indian business in the House of Commons. Never, certainly, was there a time when greater vigilance and activity were necessary on the part of members interested in the welfare of India. At the end of February Mr. Balfour introduced in the House of Commons certain new rules of procedure which, incidentally, have the effect of preventing any Indian discussion upon Friday evenings. Sir W. Wedderburn, whose speech on the subject is reported in our Parliamentary Supplement, asked Mr. Balfour what he proposed to do for "the most oppressed minority in the House"—the group of members who are interested in Indian questions. Mr. Balfour, apparently, proposes to do nothing. Sir W. Wedderburn urged with point and force that members who endeavour to further the interests of India need the fullest indulgence of the House of Commons. They have no voters behind them, and they deliberately risk the danger of being regarded as bores. The truth is, of course, that the House of Commons will never be brought to pay anything like adequate attention to Indian policy and administration until the salary, or a part of the salary, of the Secretary of State is placed, as it ought to be, upon the regular Estimates. Will Lord Welby's Commission recommend that salutary course?

"Come over and Help us."

"I lament," said Lord Rosebery in his speech at the dinner of the Eighty Club on March 3rd, "I lament the growing burdens of the country. I lament that in Parliament there is no voice raised for economy now on any question whatever, and I sometimes rub my eyes when I see on the publications of the Cobden Club that motto of 'peace, retrenchment, and reform'—a large part of which seems to have dropped out of the portable baggage of politicians." Lord Rosebery does not lament without reason. The voices which used to be heard in Parliament on behalf of economy are now hushed, and those who might have been expected to succeed to their task are too often mute where they are not actually found on the side of lavish expenditure. But let us not, for all that, overstate the case. When Lord Rosebery declares roundly that "in Parliament there is no voice raised for economy now on any question whatever" he does—unintentionally, of course—an injustice to the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. They, at any rate, have remained firm where others falter, loyal where others betray, and if Lord Rosebery would add his powerful influence to theirs in that Chamber where, as Lord Coleridge said, the voice of the people is but faintly heard, British as well as Indian taxpayers would be the gainers. Meantime, we are indebted to Lord Rosebery for an admirable maxim which, if we may adapt a suggestion of Lord Salisbury's, should be inscribed in the India Office in letters three feet long:

> "I have always believed that you will never subject your votes in Supply to a real and searching criticism until you discuss them by Grand or Standing Committees outside the walls of the House of Commons, with the necessary permanent officials in attendance to give you their information."

Exactly; and if such a plan is expedient to secure "real and searching criticism" of home expenditure, which touches the pockets of electors and therefore comes home to the business and bosoms of their representatives, how much more necessary is it in the case of Indian expenditure, which now comes before the House of Commons as a foregone conclusion, which is not in the control of the Indian people, and which is hurried through the Legislative Council without the possibility of amendment or division? The plan which Lord Rosebery thus suggests applies *a fortiori* to the Indian Budget, and it is the plan which has long been advocated by Indian public opinion and by members of Parliament interested in the welfare of India. Perhaps Lord Rosebery will, on behalf of the Indian National Congress, attend and give evidence before Lord Welby's Commission. Why not?

The Cotton Duties.

A Bombay correspondent writes on March 7th: "The air is clearer now after the recent agitation regarding the iniquitous legislation on the cotton duties. But there is not the least doubt that a strong feeling of indignation against the Government has been evoked

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

in every nook and corner of the country. Popular sentiment is naturally enraged by the altogether inexcusable conduct of our rulers. It is now manifest that the recent legislation was cut-and-dry in Calcutta when the Government was asking the Mill-owners' Association and the Chambers of Commerce to give a reply to the allegations of Manchester. The people are sore at this discreditable conduct, and they are infinitely more so at the way in which the duties have been re-arranged. Thus, while criticism on the Act has subsided, there is still a strong agitation in many towns and villages for boycott of Lancashire goods. Leagues and associations are being formed for the purpose of avoiding Lancashire fabrics and confining consumption to India-made products. Whatever may be the result of this movement, it has its source in widespread popular indignation. People are freely giving vent to what they think and feel on the subject. The spirit of hatred to British rule is predominant, and, in my opinion, the Government of Lord Elgin never did a more imprudent thing than readjusting the cotton duties in the way they have done. It has exasperated the people. It has sown a new seed of discontent, which is likely to grow to grave proportions. The truth is that want of true statesmanship is fast bringing the Government of India into contempt. Its benevolent despotism is bitterly criticised. But our rulers are either dead to these facts, or, being alive to them, affect to treat the consequences lightly. But there can be no doubt that at present the feeling of genuine attachment to British rule is diminishing, and that the Government has only itself to blame.

The Jhalawar Case.

"Equally ominous signs of disaffection may be perceived among our Native Chiefs and Princes. The deposition of the Chief of Jhalawar is agitating all the Native States. Questions in Parliament have received the usual and stereotyped answer. Of course, it was to be expected that the Government would "justify its action." When has it not? What happened in Kashmir? What happened in Manipur? What happened in minor principalities? The Government only gives its own version of these transactions—a version which needs to be supplemented by independent testimony. The version of the aggrieved party is never told, or, if it is told, it is by his accusers, who are at once judge and jury. The Jhalawar case is only one more instance of official autocracy in Native States, but it is creating an intense feeling against the British *raj*. It is refined Russianism, and no more. But the Russian makes no declaration of benevolent despotism. He speaks frankly of despotism pure and simple, and declares that those who are subject to it must abide by it for better or for worse. The Government of India, on the contrary, proclaims from the housetop that there is not an alien government on the face of the earth which is more impartial, more just, or more benevolent than itself.

Lord Sandhurst's Success.

"In Madras they are reproducing the agitation which occurred here on the eve of the departure of Lord Harris,—I mean the apotheosis of Lord Wenlock. We are better off in Bombay now. Lord Sandhurst is daily adding to his genuine popularity. He is already a favourite. He is 'the people's man' and our native journals are loud in his praises. He has now revived the old practice, in vogue in Sir Bartle Frere's time, of inviting well-known citizens to breakfast, and thus endeavouring privately to acquaint himself with the thoughts and feelings of the community. This is a step in the right direction. His liberal temper has wrought a healthy change among colleagues in the Executive Council. What with the pertinacity of our public-spirited non-official representatives, and Lord Sandhurst's own sympathy, tact, and judgment, the answers to interpellations are becoming less vague and equivocal. There is more definiteness and candour in them. As a result, public business is facilitated while public time is more usefully employed. It was a popular triumph that the unofficial members compelled Mr. Nugent, the revenue member, to abandon his Karachi Port Trust Bill which sought to deprive the Karachi municipality of its privilege of returning two members to the Port Trust Board. Wonderful to relate, Mr. Nugent further declared that hurried legislation, like hurried matrimony, was much to be deprecated. Imagine this robust bureaucrat, this pillar of Lord Harris's Government, now the opponent of hurried legislation. We owe this miraculous transformation to Lord Sandhurst."

British Troops in India.

"Truth in parentheses" may be found in many places other than in Tom Hood's sprightly verses. It is (writes an Anglo-Indian correspondent) a happy foible of the human mind, one unconsciously leaning to virtue's side, that causes some writers, while devoting all their attention to some object of pride, prejudice, or professional zeal, to drop by the way some remark or phrase of far more significance than the special doxy they are intent on preaching. One little incident of this sort occurred in one of the large-type letters recently appearing in the *Times*, relating to the change in the position and functions of the Commander-in-Chief. The military critic who obscured his, no doubt, weighty identity under the signature of "Reform," gave us this striking line—

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"the only really efficient portion of the army, that in India." This statement is as true as hard fact can make it; but its avowal may be new to many, and few of our public men, civil or military, realize its significance. How many members of the House of Commons, I wonder, when voting annually to fix the "strength" of the British Army bethink themselves that from one-fourth to one-third of that strength is paid for by India. For 1894 the total "effective strength" is given in the returns as 219,400; but this includes the Head-quarters Staff, the Household Troops, the Army Service Corps, Medical Staff and other addenda. If we deduct for the purpose of a comparison, the total would fall short of 200,000. Of these 77,250 in 1894 were returned under the head of "East India." Thus more than one-third of what the gallant correspondent of the *Times* described as "the only really efficient portion of the (British) Army" is, as he says, "in India," and is maintained, not from our overflowing Treasury, but by our unrepresented dependency.

"The only efficient portion."

Here (our correspondent continues) we have a telling illustration of what India is worth to this country. But how very few of our politicians and taxpayers think of these things. Yet this great factor in our Imperial strength, financially, is well understood by Continental statesmen, and, it may be, explains some of that envy and covetousness with which their press girds against our Empire. The least that can be expected of our statesmen and electors, those of Lancashire included, is that they should bear in mind India's contribution to that yet unwearied Titan, the British Empire. Possibly they may come to see that far too large a share is paid by the weak and subordinate partner, and, if they do see this, it should be easy for them to be so far generous in their strength as to be willing to defray, at least, that portion of Indian Military Expenditure which is paid and spent in this country—especially the Rx. 250,000, representing "compensation allowance," besides as much more for "extra pay" to the rank and file which comes under "exchange." Possibly some will say: But these troops are necessary for the defence of India, that is, for "our Indian possessions." To this the obvious rejoinder arises: if these are *our* possessions, why should not *we* pay for their defence? But to press this point would shock the Philistine official mind. For the present, then, I rest content with the very moderate suggestion of generosity hinted at above. One word more: in case our statesmen should blunder into a European war, would not the defence of India have to take care of itself, whilst a large part of "the only really efficient portion of the British army" would be speedily withdrawn to repair the damage of such blunder?

India pays the Bill.

The considerations indicated above derive fresh illustration from certain passages in the elaborate statement recently made to the House of Commons by the Under-Secretary for War, Mr. St. John Brodrick. The speech was chiefly devoted to financial details and one does not gather from it any precise indication of the whole strength of the British army. The numbers given by the Under-Secretary were 333,000 at home and in garrison, 38,400 Colonies and Egypt, and 90,000 the depôts and staff, making a total of 461,400 men. But this number evidently does not include the 74,000 serving in India, every shilling of whose pay, share of pensions, and other charges is borne by the Indian taxpayer. This consideration should ever be borne in mind, namely, that when Parliament votes, pursuant to the Mutiny Act, the total number of troops of the British army, from one-fourth to one-third of these are paid for by India, and do not come as a charge on the British taxpayer. Sir Charles Dilke, who understands the position as well as anybody, incidentally and for the purpose of his financial argument treated the subject in this way:—

"For his own part, he would lump together the expenditure for the home army and the Indian army, and he found that, while the results had been far more satisfactory in India than at home, the expenditure upon land forces in both countries was larger than that of any other Power—namely, about £36,000,000, which would probably be increased next year."

Mr. Brodrick stated the total army charges at a neat eighteen millions sterling, and Sir Charles Dilke "lumps" the cost of the Indian armies at the same sum. This interesting coincidence need not be examined too closely. But it may be noted that the Indian cost, as just stated by Sir James Westland, stands at 24·29 crores of rupees. Of that vast sum only about a third, roughly speaking, is convertible into sterling. So that Sir Charles Dilke's lumping the whole into eighteen millions sterling does not help us very much. There is great risk of serious error in expressing Indian expenditure in sterling. Sir James Westland had a lesson to that effect last year which he will not readily forget. It is worth noting that Sir C. Dilke testifies that "the results had been far more satisfactory in India." That is only another way of stating, as we have seen above, that "the only really efficient portion of our army is in India," and British taxpayers must remember that India pays for it. Yet what happens is that India is, for Imperial purposes, not only permanently burdened with an unnecessarily large army, but when her troops are employed on expeditions, not of her seeking, beyond the frontier, India pays the bill. Hence, *inter alia*, the cotton duties.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE ENIGMA OF "LOSS BY EXCHANGE."

By Sir J. B. Phear.
Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

The time of the year is at hand when the financial authorities of India are accustomed, (1) To prepare a budget estimate of India's Revenue and Expenditure for the coming financial year; (2) To revise the like estimate which was last year made for the financial year just now about to expire; (3) To ascertain and discuss the completed accounts of the preceding year. When the Secretary of State for India last autumn presented to the House of Commons his explanatory statement of the annual triplet of accounts and estimates which had thus been produced at the preceding Lady Day, he appeared to make the remarkable confession that there was in the finances of India a certain item of aggregate charge, amounting in the whole to as much as 13 crores of rupees, which transcended his powers of comprehension and eluded the control of the Indian Government and its expert advisers. He is reported to have said in the course of his speech,

"There is certain expenditure which is under the control of of the Indian Government and there is a certain charge which is not. That which is not under their control is the increased expenditure relating to exchange."

And again:—

"Right through the statement the one difficulty with which Government has to contend is the fall in exchange. It has a blighting and withering influence in every direction."

And elsewhere he said that the "loss by exchange" for the financial year 1895-96 was estimated at Rx.2,503,700.

It is perhaps not wonderful that obscurity should be the result of a financial explanation in which the terms "loss by exchange" and "charge for exchange" play the principal part, when we find that loss by exchange here spoken of is no loss at all, but merely the excess in the so-called charge for exchange of one year over that of the preceding, arising from, and indeed identical with, a fall in the rate of exchange; while charge for exchange is itself an artificial item of account, created merely for the purpose, so far as can be perceived, of exhibiting items of sterling and rupee expenditure together in the same balance-sheet. It is in fact the numerical excess by which the actual rupee cost of things and services, that have to be paid for in England with the exchange at something more than Rs. 10 per £, is greater than the amount in rupees which would have been the cost of the same things, etc., had the exchange between the two countries been at the lower rate of exactly Rs.10 per £.

To state the same thing another way. In order to make a payment of one-tenth £ (*i.e.*, 2s. or 24d.) in England the Indian Government has, under the market rates of exchange which have prevailed of late years, had to expend one rupee *plus* a fraction of a rupee in India. Thus the one rupee, *plus* a fraction of a rupee, is the charge which the Government has to meet in India in order to obtain in exchange the payment of one-tenth of a £ in England; and obviously the two parts of this item are not properly separable. But in these accounts and estimates of the Indian Government the fractional part is entered by itself as the charge for exchange, and the integral part, one rupee, goes down as the cost of the article for which the one-tenth of a £ is paid!

Not only does this method of presenting the accounts seem to be without satisfactory justification in itself, but it serves to foster the mischievous notion that there is a normal rate of exchange, which ought for some reason to obtain between Indian money and English money, namely, one rupee for one-tenth of a sovereign; and that any deviation from this rate in the shape of either addition to or deduction from the rupee is a matter of chance not to be explained, but to be accepted as a loss or a gain, as the case may be.

Indeed, the natural inference from the Secretary of State's own language would be that in his view for every two shillings of what may be termed the English expenditure, which costs one rupee, *plus* a fraction, in India, although the Government has control of the one rupee, it has no control and no foreknowledge in respect of the additional fraction of a rupee. And any increase in the fraction beyond what was anticipated he sets down as a loss.

But the question may be fairly asked: if the Government of India has, for instance, sustained a loss of Rx.2,503,700 during the present financial year by reason of a fall in the exchange, who has gained that sum? And if no one can be shown to have gained it, what has become of it?

In truth, this sum of rupees, which the Secretary of State speaks of as a loss by exchange, is, as has been already indicated, only a small portion arbitrarily separated from the total aggregate cost in rupees of material and services paid for in England—so separated and called a loss attributable to exchange because, if the rate of exchange had not altered, the cost in rupees of the same sterling expenditure in England would have been less by that sum. But the rate of exchange between the two countries is directly dependent upon the sterling prices of things on the one side and the rupee prices of things on the other, and alteration in the rate means alteration of some sort in those prices; and the alteration in prices, which brings about the fall in exchange, may be nevertheless such as to leave the return for the expenditure of one rupee the same as it was before, in which case the so-called "loss" would simply mean increased quantity of material and services paid for—in other words, increased expenditure in the ordinary sense of the term.

To see how this may be, we need to look a little closely into the leading features of the process of exchange.

When two countries have different currencies, it is obvious that a money payment cannot be made in one of the two directly by means of the coin of the other.

In the case, however, of coin being sent from the one country to the other for the purpose of making a payment it can be treated as bullion, and on its being sold in that character for as much as it will fetch in the currency of the country, the proceeds of sale can then be directly applied to making the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The transaction would be essentially the same, whatever the saleable article employed as the medium of remittance; and for various reasons it is generally more convenient for the purpose of making a money payment in a foreign country to make use in the transaction of some other usual merchantable commodity rather than coin, or even bullion.

When the person who has occasion to make the payment himself purchases the commodity in his own country, sends it to the other and there procures it to be converted by sale into the money required, it is plain (speaking generally without taking account of the cost of transmission, etc.) that the rate of exchange, *i.e.*, the proportion between the amount of money expended in the one country to the amount of money of which that expenditure procures the command in the other, is identical with the proportion between the price per unit of measurement of the exported commodity in its home market, and the price per same unit of the same commodity in the foreign market.

To take an instance, suppose a quantity of tea is in this way made use of for the purpose of effecting a remittance from India to England, then it is plain that the number of rupees expended in the purchase of the tea in India bears the same proportion to the number of pounds realized by its sale in England as the price of the tea in rupees per case in India bears to the price of the tea in pounds per case in England.

Therefore, the fraction $\frac{\text{price (in pounds) in England}}{\text{price (in rupees) in India}}$ of £1 is the exchange, per rupee, at which this transaction of exchange was effected.

Commonly, no doubt, the person who makes an ordinary remittance does not himself undertake the work of exporting the necessary commodity for the purpose, but instead of doing so he, through the agency of a banker or broker, purchases from a trader in the shape of a bill of exchange the assignment of the sale proceeds in the foreign country of an exportation already made, or being made, by the trader in the way of business. The price at which he purchases the bill is of course matter of bargaining between the parties; but it may be assumed as an approximation to it that the trader will at least demand as much for the bill as will yield him the same profit, or thereabouts, as if his correspondent in the foreign country remitted to him the sale proceeds in question by purchasing with them a return commodity, and sending it to him for sale. And were that method adopted the rate of exchange would be given, as in the above case, by the proportion which the price of the imported commodity in its country of origin bears to the price which it realizes in the country to which it is imported—a proportion which, it can easily be shown, must be less than the proportion between the foreign and home prices of the exported commodity, if the trade transaction yields any profit.

In other words, to recapitulate the results of the argument, it may be said that in making a remittance of money from India to England by means of a bill of exchange, the money paid in India would generally bear approximately the same proportion to the money to be received in exchange in England, as the market price in India of an advantageous trade commodity sent in ordinary course of commerce from England to India bears to the market price of the same commodity in England; while in making the remittance by the direct export of a commodity selected for the purpose (which may be silver coin) the money paid by the remitter in India bears approximately the same proportion to the money to be received in England as the market price in India of an advantageous commodity sent specially from India to England for sale or conversion into money bears to the market price of the same commodity in England; and the proportion in the first case is greater than that in the second, which means that the rate of exchange is less.

It is not suggested that these formulas can be made use of to obtain numerical results of a practical kind; but if the considerations which have led to them are substantially sound in fact, they serve to show that the question as to the rate of exchange between India and England is not that inscrutable mysterious thing which the Secretary of State represents it to be, but in itself (to put the matter briefly) merely expresses a general relation between the silver prices of commodities in India and their gold prices in England.

From the foregoing we learn that a fall in exchange in making remittances from India to England may be due either to *increase in the general purchasing power of gold*, or *diminution in the general purchasing power of silver*, or a combination of both.

If it be assumed (as it commonly is by those who argue in favour of bimetallism) that the purchasing power of silver in India has not appreciably altered during the variation which has taken place in the rate of exchange, except, of course, as regards gold, then the fall in the rate must be due solely to increase in the purchasing power of gold; and although the number of sovereigns for which a given number of rupees will exchange is by this cause lessened, their purchasing power is increased in approximately the same proportion, and so the expenditure of rupees in India goes just as far as before in discharge of the indebtedness in England.

In fact, the silver prices of things, whether paid for immediately in silver or after a step of exchange in gold coin, must by the hypothesis remain unchanged.

But the indebtedness of India in England, which has to be discharged through the process of exchange, is in respect of commodities bought or services rendered from England on account of India. And, therefore, in the case supposed of a fall in exchange due solely to increase of the purchasing power of gold, if additional silver has to be paid in India in order to discharge the indebtedness in England, this is not really attributable to the alteration in the rate of exchange, but must mean one of two things, namely:

(i) Either that a corresponding additional quantity of commodities and services has been had—*i.e.*, that there has been additional material expenditure by India to the extent of the additional rupees;

(ii) Or that the gold prices of the commodities and services which India has had to pay for (or some of them) have for some cause gone up, notwithstanding the increase in the general purchasing power of gold.

These are possible alternatives, which the Secre-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

tary of State's Explanatory Memorandum affords us no means of testing: but which should be the subjects of the closest and most searching enquiry on the part of those who are charged with the responsible duty of preparing the Budget Estimate for the year.

If on the other hand the fall in the rate of exchange is assumed to be due to a diminution of the general purchasing power of silver, in that case not only do the silver prices of things paid for in England through the operation of exchange in gold coin rise in amount, but the immediate silver prices of things in India must generally do so also in the same proportion—a consequence of serious import to the Government of India inasmuch as a large portion of the revenue is of a permanently fixed character.

LOOKING BACKWARDS.—I.

By A. O. Hume, C.B.

Our good friend and colleague, *The Champion*, of Bombay, in a recent article (on "Sir R. Temple's Reminiscences of the Indian Mutiny") with which I am generally in accord, introduces a remark which I fear may lead to serious misconceptions in a generation unborn when the troubles of 1857-58 supervened. He says, speaking of these:

"It was never a mere military mutiny that shook the British dominion in India to its foundations and went nigh to overthrow it."

Now if he only means that the plot was not *absolutely* wholly a military one, and that there *were* non-military wire-pullers, he is unquestionably correct, but if he means, and this is what most readers will conclude, that the *people* of India took an appreciable part in originating the conspiracy, or even in aiding and abetting it when it had developed, he is, I believe, sadly misinformed.

I was in India seven years before the disturbances commenced, I was right through them, in the very vortex of the cyclone. I had always been on the most friendly and intimate terms with Indians of all ranks, and from the day the outbreak commenced at Meerut (for none of us understood the significance of the Barackpore mutiny) and for at least twenty-five years subsequently, I never lost a single opportunity of probing to the utmost limits possible, the sources of this terrible cataclysm. I have confidentially discussed the subject with simply thousands of the more intelligent elders, in the North-West Provinces, Oudh, the Punjab, Rajputana, the Central Provinces, and Central India—with Hindus and Mussulmans, princes, peasants, merchants, lawyers, traders, farmers, and I unhesitatingly affirm as the result of my own observations during the storm, and my long, patient, and widespread subsequent investigations, that on 999-1,000ths of the people of India, this burst quite as unexpectedly and quite as incomprehensibly as it did on the European community, and, further, that even when it was at its worst and when the masses fully believed that the sun of British rule had set never again to rise, not 1 per cent of those masses took any part in what has been called by some a rebellion, but was, in reality, mainly a widespread mutiny of mercenaries.

Of course, as this mutiny suspended all civil authority, numbers of criminals, both those at large at the moment and those released from our gaols by the mutineers, took advantage of this summary sheathing of the sword of justice to reap an easy harvest; but even of these the vast majority never really joined the soldiery, never actively operated against *us*, but contented themselves with plundering their weaker fellow-countrymen.

No doubt a number of the lower class Mussulmans, customs and revenue peons, burkandazes (policemen), butchers, weavers, and the like, a huge number, but certainly in the aggregate not amounting to two per cent. of the Mussulmans of India, believing that the rule of the King of Delhi was about to be re-established, made off to that old Mussulman capital, here and there committing excesses before starting, or *en route*.

No doubt some of the cattle-thieving tribes, Ahirs, Mewatees, Meenas, Meos, and the like, who had always given trouble under the emperors, again relapsed into their old evil ways; as also a portion, only a small portion, of the people of Oudh stuck to their hereditary chiefs, the Talooquedars, and fought against us.

No doubt here and there chiefs who had been, or conceived they had been, unjustly treated turned against us with their immediate following; but when all allowances, and these are many (too numerous to record in detail), are made, the fact remains that even at the worst time, before Delhi had fallen, not one per cent. of the population of India were hostile either to British rule or to Europeans.

Equally is it a fact that even in a place like Oudh the greatest of the Talooquedars had no forewarning of what was coming. Rájá Man Singh[1] deplored to me that it all came upon him like a bolt from the blue, so that he had been able to make no preparations, though, able man as he was, when it had come he seized the opportunity that offered and made the best of it. When Rájá Man Singh of Oudh had had no foreknowledge of the outbreak, all who knew the man and the position he held in the very heart of what, in those days, was, owing to the recent deposition of the Nawab, or King of Oudh, the greatest centre of disaffection in the whole empire, will at once realise what an absolutely infinitesimal fraction of the Indians can have had the slightest inkling of what was coming. As a matter of fact, all over Upper India estates were being bought, new houses built, new groves planted; large orders for goods had been sent down to Calcutta, thousands of boats loaded with grain, pulses, seeds and cotton, were afloat on the Jumna

[1] I had a special connexion with Man Singh and the other Talooquedars. They had been most unjustly treated, and I had strongly advocated their cause in various papers; and when Sir C. Wingfield, who had been fighting for them as Chief Commissioner, was leaving India, he brought the two leaders, Rájá Man Singh and Tujummul Hoosein, and the secretary, Dukhinarangan Mookerjee, over to me at Etawah, and told them thenceforth to consult me in all their difficulties, which they did, until at last an equitable arrangement with Government was effected equitable to all parties as I then thought, but as it has proved, owing to the wording of the Act, giving them I fear, rather more and the rayats rather less, than quite fair.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and Ganges, and everywhere marriages were being solemnised and arranged; forts had been allowed to go into disrepair, and not one single nobleman, that I could learn of, from Meerut to Allahabad, which includes the whole central stage of the struggle, had added a single man to his retainers or had the remotest idea that the poor old softly snoozing "Pax Britannica" was about to be so summarily ejected from her comfortable cot.

I have said that not one per cent of the population was even at the worst time hostile either to our rule or to Europeans, and some of the proofs of these points are these. As to the first, in the course of less than twelve months, we were able to enlist a quarter of a million troops, levies, police and guards, horse and foot. who all remained faithful during the great and prolonged crisis, and many of whom really fought like heroes. Now these men were drawn from the people, and had the people been even our passive ill-wishers, these men would not have risked their lives in what, when at least half of them enlisted, was believed to be a losing cause. As to the second, every European, who could escape into the country, get out, in fact, of the clutches of the soldiery, the criminals, the butchers and fanatical low-class Mussulmans of the towns. was saved. Everywhere the villagers sheltered them, hid them, fed them, and as soon as possible, piloted them, more or less disguised, through the stormy waves of the revolt to one of those rare island-like oases where England still had a foothold.

But it may be objected that a great deal of fighting went on all over the country, even in quite rural villages This is quite true. In the first place, huge bands of dacoits, the late tenants of our innumerable broken jails, roamed the country openly attacking hamlets and even large villages. One leader, by name Alledad Khan Mewati, whom we afterwards disposed of satisfactorily, had under him a force of 2,000 men and four guns, and numbers of villages that he attacked fought him for days, and in many instances compelled him to sheer off, after no little loss. Again, all government being suspended old quarrels were resumed where they had been left off fifty odd years before, and, most fruitful source of all fighting and troubles, hundreds, nay thousands, of landholders who had lost their villages under our usury laws and civil court processes, attempted to regain possession of their ancestral acres, and though the new holders not unfrequently tried to fight the matter out with the help of men hired in the towns, the villagers usually sided with their old proprietors and the final result not unfrequently was the premature, but not lamented, decease of the usurer, too often a forger and cheat as well as a money-lender. Yes, there was a prodigious amount of fighting and village burning and all that, throughout the Doab especially, but that was not directed against us, nor did it lead to danger to Europeans. On the contrary, when a fugitive European arrived, where two villages were busily fusillading each other, the fight would be suspended, both sides would bring him food and drink and give him a cot to rest upon, and send him on his way with guides to the next important village—only resuming their engagement when he had passed quite out of range.

So far, therefore, as the entire population was concerned the outbreak was a mere military mutiny, and despite the individual chiefs, potentates, and nobles who had suffered more or less unjustly at our hands, and who in this outbreak deemed that an opportunity of redressing those wrongs had been sent by Heaven, joining actively against us, at no time was one per cent. of the population hostile, but even at the worst the immense mass of the people were actively or passively on our side, and friendly both to our rule and ourselves individually.

It is well that this should be clearly realised, well that England should remember the immeasurable debt of gratitude that she owes to India's millions, who stood by her in those days of danger and distress—danger and distress due entirely to her own unwisdom, and alas, injustice as well.

LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT IN MADRAS.

By Alexander Rogers.
Late of the Bombay Civil Service.

With reference to the answers, relating to the Land Revenue Administration of the Madras Presidency, given to Sir W. Wedderburn in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for India on the 19th instant, it may be interesting to your readers to learn a few details, to enable them to understand more fully the causes that have led to the present state of affairs.

In a rayatvári settlement, that is to say, one in which the State contracts for the payment of land revenue directly with individual cultivators in place of heads of villages, it is necessary to assess the lands field by field, as each tenant holds on an average only four or five acres. After an accurate measurement of such fields, the quality of the soil of each must be ascertained by the classification of that soil, and according to that quality a money assessment has to be imposed on the field as the rent to be paid to the State.

I wish to describe the processes under which these two indispensable operations are carried out in Madras according to the instructions laid down in the authorised Manual.

Land is supposed to come under one or other of five orders: these are (1) the regar or black cotton soil; (2) the red ferruginous; (3) the arenaceous; (4) the alluvial and permanently improved; and (5) the calcareous. Each order is divided into classes, the exceptional into two, the others into three each. The class of a soil is determined by the quantity of clay it contains, meaning by clay that impalpable matter which is formed by the combination of minute particles of the primitive earths with organic matter in a state of decay (N.B.—This description is quoted word for word from the Manual). The three soil classes are "clay," "loam," and "sand." Clay soils of each series (order) are those containing more than 66 per cent. of clay; loamy soils are those with one-third to two-thirds clay and the rest sand; sandy soils those with more than two-thirds sand. In selecting samples the soil is turned up to a depth of six or eight inches, and the proportions of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

sand and clay, where doubtful, are tested by dissolution in water. The classes again are subdivided into sorts, the sort being determined on the same consideration as the class. From the first, Government has deprecated any attempt at making an accurately scientific classification of soils. The classes adopted are few and based on tangible differences of soil; for the most part eye, finger, and thumb, are the classifier's only guides, and the nearest approach to a scientific method that is allowed him is when in cases of doubt he tests for clay by simple methods which give its bulk or weight, but do not indicate its chemical composition.

Now, is this method of classification simple, practical, and trustworthy? Letting alone the absurdity that lowly-paid native classifiers (or any classifiers, for that matter) can be trusted to go through thousands of fields to ascertain, either by manipulation or dissolution in water, whether a lump of soil contains under 33, over 33, or over 66 per cent. of so-called clay, a fact which could not be ascertained without weighing the sample of earth, evaporating the water, and weighing the residue, the method is chemically wrong, for the phosphates and nitrates which give a soil its fertility, as well as the salts that diminish it, are soluble in water, and would, therefore, disappear from the calculation.

The system, moreover, is, as far as the instructions for classification go, extremely faulty in not taking into account other deteriorating influences that take from the value, such as want of depth (a most important consideration in a rocky country), sloping surface that allows water in the rains to wash away the soil, impregnation with salt, too great an admixture of gravel, etc.

Even the orders of soil are imperfectly defined. There is no such thing as "permanently improved," as the Madras manual lays down in No. 4, for the effect of no manure lasts for ever. If the definition is meant to apply to land turned from unirrigated to irrigated, or embanked or improved in that kind of way, that is no reason why it should be reckoned a natural order of soil.

But suppose all these processes completed, is it right to describe them as simple and practical? A field in its soil must belong to one of three classes (clay, loam, or sand) of one of five orders (regar, ferruginous, arenaceous, alluvial and permanently improved, and calcareous): that is to say, there are fifteen different categories to which any soil may belong, and a poorly-paid classifier on, perhaps, 10 to 20 rupees a month has to decide to which. Add to this that his so-called water test in a test-tube or similar vessel is not carried out by weighing the residue, and may vary for every part of a field tested without a chance of detection by his supervising officer, and as wide a door for bribery is opened as most lowly-paid classifiers need generally desire.

In this system lies the original cause of failure of equitable assessment, that is, proportional to the intrinsic qualities of the soil, in Madras. There is no standard with which those qualities can be compared, and all is, therefore, haphazard and uneven.

The answers given by Lord George Hamilton referred to above are conspicuously lacking in candour. I hereby challenge him publicly to disprove any one of the figures given in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions further than two little slips which may be accounted for by printers' errors, for they were all taken from the Madras Revenue reports. When he said that the Madras Government hoped to report shortly, he did not tell the House, as he should have if he wished to state the real facts of the case, that the matter has been before them already over three years. Again, in quoting the number of evictions for 1883 and 1890 he burked the fact that those for 1891-2 were 11,118, for 1892-3 12,400 and for 1893-4 14,198.

I proceed now to the system of assessment itself. The most superficial observer passing over a few acres of standing crops in any part of the world cannot fail to see the great differences there are in these crops even in adjoining fields, notwithstanding the apparently identical geological and climatic circumstances. Anyone walking over the same ground when bare of crops would see at a glance sufficient to account for such differences in the marks of runlets of water caused by the natural flow of the drainage and variety in colour of soil, which would be accentuated if he examined its texture on the surface, or digging a little deeper (say eighteen inches, the least depth to which fertile soil should go), found a substratum, more or less near to that surface, of stone, or impervious clay, or sand, or other unfertile substance. If in a space of a few acres there are such differences to be seen, those to be found in thousands of square miles of country, in which geological and climatic circumstances must vary immensely, must be altogether beyond calculation. Notwithstanding this, the Madras system of assessment is to this day based on the supposed average produce of soils, complicated, after deduction of from one-fourth to one-sixth to allow for vicissitudes of seasons, by conversion of that produce into money at an average of prices of the principle varieties of grain for a period of twenty years, and, by deduction from the money value thus arrived at, of the average expense of cultivation per acre, such as the cost of agricultural cattle and of their keep, seed, hire of labour (permanent and temporary), implements, manure and transplanting. Some of these items, such as the cost of cattle and farm tools, have even to be subdivided and spread over more than one year.

The figures of these elaborate processes of calculation must be a curiosity, and their mere enumeration, carried out, as they are, over experiments on crops to the number of 2,000 or 3,000 in a single district, is sufficient to convince anyone not under the influence of the magic of figures of the impracticable nature of the system of thus assessing the proper rents of individual fields, which are taken at one-half the residue, called the net produce, after the deductions noted above.

Each field has in the meanwhile been classed under one of the fifteen categories of soil already mentioned. Each field having thus been ascertained to be of a certain sort geologically and agriculturally (what the latter term means it is difficult to understand), and the amount of the money value of the net produce of that sort having been fixed in the manner described above, it is said that the tenant

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

knows how much he will have to pay, that is, 50 per cent. of the money value of the net produce fixed for his particular sort. If such is the case, he and the classer will not be long in coming to terms as to the nature of the entry to be made against his field, and the slight chance of detection when one that ought to be (say) "Regar—clay—1st sort," is recorded as "3rd sort—sand," when the imperfect water test already described is supposed to have been applied, will be run.

A consideration of the distance of the field from the village site and water, an element that, in the people's eyes, greatly affects the value of a field, appears to be omitted altogether from the calculation. Again, no one but the settling officer should know till the last moment how the whole of a village will be affected as regards its rates of assessment by its proximity to or distance from markets for the sale of produce, or by the greater or less certainty of the rainfall in consequence of the vicinity of hills or forests. If some rayats have the chance, it is not in their nature not to attempt to bribe in order to get his rent lowered, and the system described gives him the chance with little fear of detection, for, as pointed out above, the water test, even if honestly carried out, is entirely fallacious.

I do not speak without book in denouncing this system of assessment, as I have been doing officially to the India Office authorities for over three years, for it was tried in Bombay and condemned about fifty years ago. Notwithstanding this, Madras has persevered in it, with the result that there are still about 3½ millions of acres of assessed land lying waste and unprofitable to the State, tenants by the thousand are evicted every year in order to realise the land revenue, and when their property is put up to auction the greater portion has to be bought in by Government for want of bidders, what is sold fetching at the forced sales about one fourth of its estimated value.

Is it not time that some decided steps should be taken to put a stop to this disastrous state of affairs, when cotton duties have to be imposed in order to make the Indian budget balance? Madras men have said to me that the people evicted are speculators who take up land without any intention of holding it beyond a year or two, whilst the strength it has acquired through lying fallow may last. If such were the case, why should they not give it up of their own accord instead of having to be evicted, and .why should they expose themselves to the risk of their property being seized and sold for a quarter of its estimated value? If the land were equitably assessed, with a margin for landlord's profits, would they not continue to hold it and let it lie fallow when it required to be so left? The truth of the case is that the land is rack-rented under the system described, and it is not worth the tenants' while to hold it. The whole system requires to be abolished, and one more profitable both to the State and its tenants, as it exists in Bombay, adopted.

[Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., as will be seen from "Our London Letter," has asked for a full Return of Evictions, etc., in the Madras Presidency for each of the years 1883-4 to 1893-4.—Ed. India.]

THE ABOLITION OF TRIAL BY JURY.

By A. Nundy.

The Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill is still pending before the Legislative Council of India, and, though there are good reasons for anticipating that the obnoxious clause interfering with the so-called finality of verdicts given by juries in certain cases will be withdrawn, no announcement to that effect has yet been made by the Government of India, and the probability is that in some modified form an attempt will be made by the Legal Member to get it passed by the Legislature. Sir Alexander Miller, in his latest utterance before the Council, stated that if in Committee the retention of this section were objected to, he would move its rejection. But the ways of the Government of India are devious, and it can never be confidently predicted what will happen. Besides, it is desirable that English readers should be apprised of the utter disregard shown by the Government of India for the rights and the feelings of the people, in its attempt practically to deprive them of the privilege of trial by jury, such as it is at present. For, strictly speaking, this privilege as understood in Europe is rigidly confined to cases tried by the High Courts of India in the exercise of their original criminal jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is exercised with reference to all offences of a serious nature occurring in the Presidency towns (Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay), and with reference to offences committed by European British subjects outside the Presidency towns. So far as Indians outside the Presidency towns are concerned, the privilege of trial by jury is subject to the following limitations and disabilities:—

(*a*) In the North-Western Provinces, Punjab, Central Provinces, and some of the minor dependencies, a trial by jury is not permitted at all.

(*b*) In the Bengal, Bombay, and Madras Presidencies it is permitted only in certain districts, and as regards certain offences specially notified by the local government.

(*c*) The verdict given by juries is not final, for if the sessions judge disagree with it, he may, under sec. 307 of the Criminal Procedure Code, "submit the case to the High Court, recording the grounds of his opinion, and when the verdict is one of acquittal, stating the offence which he considers to have been committed." The High Court in dealing with the case "may acquit or convict the accused of any offence of which the jury could have convicted him, . . . and if it convicts him may pass such sentence as might have been passed by the court of session.

Such are the great privileges which constitute an offence to some English officials. Whereas the Congress on the one hand is agitating for the extension of trial by jury, the Government on the other hand is seeking to add to the restrictions and limitations under which it exists in certain parts, and practically to render it nugatory and inoperative. In Bengal, Sir Charles Elliott, at a stroke, deprived the people of this privilege, in the year 1892, but his jury notifi-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

cation, raised such a storm of indignation and remonstrance, that the Government of India had to appoint a special commission and in deference to the views of this commission, the late Lieut.-Governor of Bengal withdrew his notification. The Government of India is now attempting to curtail the existing privileges of the people, restricted as they are.

What are the reasons which have induced the Government of India to take this step? Ostensibly the object is to provide against perverse verdicts which, it is alleged, are given by juries in certain cases—in other words, to provide against verdicts which do not commend themselves to the executive authorities. To deal with perverse verdicts the existing provisions of the law are ample and adequate, for the High Courts acting under section 307 have always reversed such verdicts. But it is in reality the construction put on this section by the High Courts which has led the Government to seek a modification of the existing law. The executive authorities are of opinion that the High Courts put a very narrow construction on that section, and thus abstain from interfering with the verdict of a jury, when in the exercise of their legal powers they would have done well to set it aside. The Government would have been pleased if the High Courts, after reviewing the whole of the evidence, had confirmed the verdict of the jury if they agreed with it, or set it aside if they disagreed with it. But the judges of the High Court act on quite another principle: they have uniformly held that they will not set aside the verdict of a jury merely because they do not agree with it, but only in such cases as they find it to be clearly and manifestly wrong and perverse.

To tie the hands of the High Court, it is proposed to amend Sec. 303 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which is as follows:—

"The jury shall return a verdict on all the charges on which the accused is tried, and the judge may ask them such questions as are necessary to ascertain what their verdict is."

In other words, the jury is to bring in a verdict of guilty or not guilty, but if there be any ambiguity in their verdict the judge may try to clear it by further questions; otherwise he must accept it. For this section it is now proposed to substitute the following provisions:—

(*a*) The judge may require the jury to return a special verdict consisting of separate findings on any particular questions of fact which he may desire, and *he* shall thereupon determine whether, in accordance with such findings, the accused is to be recorded as having been convicted or acquitted by the jury.

(*b*) After a general verdict has been returned, if the judge is in doubt whether it is one with which he should or should not express agreement, he may require the jury further to return a special verdict on any question or questions of fact on which he may desire their opinion, and shall, after the receipt of such special verdict, finally determine whether to agree or disagree with the verdict of the jury.

(*c*) After a special verdict has been returned under the above clauses, if the judge requires any further information on any questions of fact, he may require the jury to return a further special verdict as to such questions of fact, and shall then finally determine whether a verdict of acquittal or of conviction is to be recorded.

(*d*) In any of the foregoing cases, if the judge is in doubt as to the meaning of the verdict returned, he may ask such questions as may be necessary to ascertain what the verdict is.

Such is the purport of the provisions sought to be introduced by the new Bill. It is no exaggeration to say that in the hands of a clever judge a jury might, under these provisions, be induced to bring in any verdict which the judge might wish.

But is there any foundation for the allegation that Indian juries are in the habit of returning perverse verdicts? Taking Bengal as an instance we find, by reference to the report of the High Court on the Criminal Administration of that Province, that in the year 1894 the number of persons tried by jury was 464, and their verdict in respect to 407 persons was approved by the sessions judge, and disapproved in respect of 57, *i.e.*, as regards 12 per cent. of the cases. Acting under Sec. 307 of the Criminal Procedure Code, the sessions judge made a reference to the High Court as regards 39 persons. Of the cases so referred, 28 were heard and decided by the High Court, and in 11 cases the verdict of the jury was upheld, but in 17 cases it was reversed. Thus we find that the number of cases in which the High Court, disagreeing with the jury, set aside their verdict was 2·5 per cent. of the total number of cases decided by the jury, or, taking into account the cases not reported by the sessions judges but with the verdict in which he disagreed, we find that the High Court could not possibly have set aside more than 4·5 per cent. of the total number of cases. But if we look at the statistics for the last ten years relating to the decisions of sessions judges with the aid of assessors, it will be found that on an average 28 per cent. of these cases were reversed.

It is a peculiar fact that where public opinion is unanimous in condemning certain existing abuses, the Government of India is slow in moving to correct these abuses; but it is eager to bring about changes in respect of matters about which there has been no complaint. The people of India are praying for the separation of the executive and judicial functions exercised by certain magistrates, and the Government, though convinced of the reasonableness of the prayer, turns a deaf ear to it. Yet whereas there is a consensus of opinion as to the satisfactory results of trial by jury, the Government is anxious practically to do away with it. Even assuming that it has been a failure, it is the people who suffer by it. How comes it, then, that they do not complain? Journals of all shades and representing all communities have united in protesting against the proposed modification in the law as being reactionary and uncalled for. Indignation meetings have been held in different parts of the country, unreservedly condemning the Government for attempting to interfere with the long established rights of the people. If trial by jury is a failure, then some explanation ought to be forthcoming why those who are its victims should display such a unanimity in upholding it. In the statement of objects and reasons for bringing in the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill the Government says:—

"The object of the Bill is to give effect to such of the recommendations made by the Jury Commission of 1894 as have been approved by the Government of India and Her Majesty's Secretary of State;"

but it is a curious fact that the Jury Commission did not approve of any amendments which had for their

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

object the obtaining of a special verdict. They say:

"We are not in favour of any alteration in the present law, which provides sufficient means for obtaining a verdict, and we think that there are strong objections to anything of the nature of a cross-examination of the jurors as to details of a case so as to obtain their opinions on portions of the evidence. . . . . We have considered anxiously whether it is practicable to enable the judge to direct the jury to return a special verdict on issues. This proposal is supported by high authority, and we are fully sensible of the advantage it would be to the High Court in referred cases to have a special instead of general verdict to deal with, but we have reluctantly come to the conclusion that such a procedure would be liable to create greater evils than it would remedy."

This is the opinion of a Commission presided over by a judge of the High Court who, as a civilian, had filled for a number of years the office of Sessions Judge. Two of the members of the Commission were respectively an ex-judge of the High Court, who had acted as Chief Justice of Bengal, and Sir Griffith Evans, one of the leading barristers of the Calcutta High Court, who is a *persona grata* with the Government of India, having been for a number of years successively nominated to a seat in the Legislative Council.

The Government of India is undoubtedly in a peculiar predicament. Its views have been repudiated by the Commission appointed by itself, and the judges of the High Court are no more inclined to give it their support. The Bengal High Court judges

"do not recommend any change in the law, believing as they do that such a change would be followed by practical difficulties of an embarrassing and far-reaching nature."

The Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court records a minute in which the other judges concur to the following effect:

"As to the proposed amendment to empower the sessions judges to require a special verdict on particular issues of fact, there is no reason why it should be exercised in one case rather than in another, and the result will be that jurors will virtually be called upon to give their reasons, and would thus differ but little, if at all, from assessors. I agree with the Commission that such a procedure will be liable to create greater evils than it would remedy."

And, alas for the Government! even the sessions judges are not unanimous in expressing a desire for an amendment, for some of them have written strongly to deprecate any modification of the existing law. Under these circumstances it would be matter for no surprise if Sir Alexander Miller were finally to withdraw the obnoxious clause from the Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill now pending before the Council. He would do well to take that course. But why, in the name of common sense, was the clause inserted?

ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF INDIA.

By an Independent Politician.

India is a veiled secret, a mere metaphysical problem to most Englishmen. Startling events push aside the veil and transform the metaphysical into the real, with an immense, healthy, if momentary, shock to our common sense. Famine or riot, a frontier war, or a deficit in the revenue, comes along, and for a time we are all amazed at our own ignorance. At first this ignorance seems criminal, because it convicts us of negligence and stupidity, and then we begin to excuse ourselves because India is so far away, so vast, so miraculous a problem, and we fly to the so-called experts, who are delighted to cram us with what they know, to lull us into confidence in their ability, and to assure us that we had better attend to our own affairs. How can we know anything of India if we have never lived there, if we have never fought there, if we have never had a share in ruling her? Then we are treated to dogmatic utterances which we are told we ought to accept, unquestioned, on pain of being regarded as irrational; and probably we doze off again into a sweet sense of the necessary finiteness of our own knowledge and the value of official assertions.

The fact is that we are discouraged in our investigations, if not bewildered, by the greatness of many Indian problems. Few politicians of an independent turn of mind have not been brow-beaten and silenced in this fashion. If a man wishes to take a clear common sense view for himself, he is regarded as something of a fanatic. A common sense view of Indian questions, indeed! Why the experts, as they call themselves, are up in arms at once against such a revolutionary tendency. It must not be permitted. The secrets of India must be kept, as a rule, from the profane eyes of the vulgar multitude. It is a place to which we send governors, civil servants, soldiers, and missionaries, with an occasional wide-awake traveller who is always jumped upon for his mistakes, if he makes any, and for rudeness if he ventures to call a spade a spade. When officials return we can question them, in a submissive frame of mind, and difference from them is held to be an obvious absurdity, so that we remain in a curious kind of comatose ignorance, and the men who govern dumb millions in India expect to meet with persons as intellectually submissive in England. The exercise of common sense is denied to us. It has been my experience on many occasions. It has been the experience of hundreds of others. We want a common sense view, and we cannot get it. What we are always invited to accept is official expert opinion, wrapped up for us in pretty paper, as if it were a packet of cigarettes.

I shall be told that this is an exaggeration. My answer is that English opinions are always blunted, English investigations discouraged, English criticisms pushed aside by this amazing superiority of the experts. We are asked to be as docile as the Hindus, to be as ready to applaud; and when we cannot applaud, because we do not understand, to be thankful that, in our ignorance, there are wise men at hand who can give us their knowledge freely. I say that this is a danger and a discredit to us, and a danger and a discredit to India. At home it leads to mental sloth, indifference, and readiness to accept any silly excuse for expenditure or a reckless policy. It makes the experts a caste. It shuts from the masses of the English people all quick sense of responsibility. It destroys touch with enlightened civil opinion in India, whenever and wherever it is known to exist. It smothers it up so

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

that we find ourselves wondering whether it ever exists at all. To most English politicians, in fact, there is no such thing as Indian opinion, or there ought not to be, outside of the governing or the military class. I defy any one to call this a common sense view. But I ought to say that a curious admission is often made the better to beguile us into complacency. Bazaar opinion is scornfully referred to as if it were the only kind of opinion to be got at—a wild, reckless, infantile kind of prattle that is to be always ignored. Contrast this with official enlightenment, calm, benignant, opulent, and then judge for yourselves, is the advice given.

The danger of this state of things is real. If common-sense English opinion does not make itself heard and felt, is not cultivated and strengthened, common-sense Indian opinion, of the best kind, will not be respected either. Just now it is the fashion in India to laugh at Lancashire opinion because it is interested, selfish, mercenary. But the general opinion of England which finds expression, if I may so describe it, in dumb acquiescence in independent finance, is a great power. Were it as strong on other questions, were it as sure on frontier questions, were it as clear on Indian political and social questions, what a power it would be! It can only become real by a common-sense study of Indian questions, by something like a revolt against the refined despotism of officialism and expertism, and by a free discussion of whatever happens in our Indian Empire as concerning our morality, our political position in the world, our possible future. In a word, if we want to develop true enlightened common-sense opinion in India, we must begin by resolving to set the example of emancipation from the thralls of our official personages at home.

The theory of our government in India requires the exercise of intellectual manhood. The old theory, now getting ragged and rent, was that we ruled India in the interests of England, as conqueror and suzerain. I find that we are getting a bit ashamed of this theory, but we flaunt it in our Jingo moods. It underlies every chapter in the development of our frontier policy. But if this be so, we must intelligently understand our own interests, and the more we apply our common sense criticisms the better. The expert answer always is: "Yes; but you must let us interpret British interests for you, and what we say is gospel." Ah! I reply, the gospel of a scientific Afghan frontier nineteen years ago, now banned and rotten; the gospel of a Chitral annexation to-day." This is what I call a common sense view. The newer theory of our rule is that we govern in the interests of India, and hence some show of deference must be paid to Indian opinion and interests. I write "show" with meaning, for it is only a show. It assumes the same amazing ignorance in India, the same mild-eyed meekness that has been, until quite recently, habitual in England. But my contention is that if you change the theory you must alter the method. Interpretation must not still be official and expert when native interests are pleaded, put in, exalted, and recognised. Some plan must be devised—it is not my province to suggest it—for the better development and ascertainment, the quicker recognition of what the best Indians think and feel upon questions vital to their financial, political, and social well being.

The security for this efficiency is only to be found in the removal of the dense ignorance of Englishmen. There is no other way of getting rid of the dominance of what is often narrow, prejudiced, but still considered expert opinion. Personally, I have constantly striven to get at the bottom of many Indian problems in an independent way, and when I have come across any pert official, I have managed to hold my own, and sometimes events have proved my case. I want my countrymen to bestir themselves in view of their responsibilities, and to pay more attention to the frontier, financial, and internal questions of the Indian Empire. Parliament will then be influenced for good. India will feel the effect of this new spirit, official opinion will become less dogmatic. The old theory of rule and the new will be blended into some clearer system. The English conscience will quicken the Indian conscience, and be sharpened by it in turn. The great secret will be unveiled, the problem will become a real one, the future will be clearer and more luminous.

"ALL MEMBERS FOR INDIA"!

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

The agitation on the question of the cotton duties has entered upon another phase. Public meetings, attended by both Hindus and Muhammadans with a sprinkling of Europeans, have been held in different cities in India, and have passed resolutions to boycott all imported cloth, and have pledged themselves to wear only the produce of Indian looms. The Sarvajanik Sabha of Poona, perhaps the most influential political association in India, has solemnly resolved to desist from the use of English-made stuffs. The vernacular press is preaching a similar crusade, and is supported by some of the English papers. A quotation from each will suffice. Says the *Mahratta*, published in Poona:—

"Take an oath, a holy oath, by the love you bear to India, by the noble memory of your heroic Aryan ancestors, that as long as Great Britain does not wipe off the disgraceful spot of dark injustice that disfigures her name, that as long as India is made the shuttlecock of party politics in England, that as long as the people of this country are not treated as men who have every right to all that an Englishman delights in as subjects of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, India will have nothing to do with cloth which has been produced and stained by selfishness. Resolve rather to die than touch one inch of Manchester cloth. There is energy enough in the country to supply the wants of its people. Use Indian cloth and Indian cloth alone. Let every one who buys one yard of British cloth be branded a traitor to his country—to be shunned as a veritable monster. Beloved countrymen, rise up in a manner worthy of our just cause, convince a Christian people, how Indians can nobly suffer with more than Christian fortitude, emulate the patriotic Irish and the heroic American, declare a war to the death with the commerce of Lancashire."

And the *Indian Mirror* (Calcutta) writes:

"Let it be shown from one end of the country to the other that we are not quietly going to accept legislation of this sort, and that we mean to continue our protests against it till our wrongs are righted and our grievances remedied. And if we cannot successfully appeal to the conscience of either the Government of India or the Secretary of State, or even Parlia-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ment, the remedy in this one matter at least lies in our own hands. Then the watchwords of this country shall be: 'Boycott Lancashire, and have Swadeshi goods for ever!'"

A correspondent of the same journal closes a long letter as follows:

"Does England propose to drive India to despair in the same way? (referring to America and Ireland). Let her beware! God forbid that she should ever bungle and blunder in the same way here. For in Ireland she has to deal with a few millions only, whereas here she has got to deal with hundreds of millions. It is the pinching poverty of the people that so terribly convulsed France, and led the French people to resort to most awful acts of violence at about this time last century; and history repeats itself. He is a wise ruler who takes lesson from the history of the past."

After exhorting England to behave justly and generously, the writer proceeds:

"But should England refuse to behave properly we Indians have a solemn duty to perform. We must in that case stand shoulder to shoulder, we must unite as one man, and boycott everything English. We must shake off our sheepish docility, and so act as would have done honour to old Rome when Rome did honour to mankind. Let Manchester and Lancashire take heed in time, or there will be war to the knife between them and ourselves. We either ruin them or we ruin ourselves—we must either do or die."

This is the first time in the history of the British empire in India that the people have evinced a disposition to resent the action of the Indian Government by entering into a combination which, if persisted in, is calculated to produce serious consequences. It will reduce the revenue derived from the import duty on cotton goods, it will inflict great injury upon British trade, but above all it will embitter the feelings of the Indian and the English people towards each other. I feel sure that neither Lancashire nor the British Government ever anticipated that they were raising such a storm or they would have paused before they adopted a line of conduct which ignores the obligation due by a Government to its subjects, and shows a total insensibility to the feelings of the people. English officials profess to be as omniscient as they say they are beneficent in their actions. Whilst on the one hand they entertain a profound conviction that their actions are actuated by the kindest motives, on the other hand they are equally certain that they are fully and correctly informed of the sentiments the people harbour towards them. I emphatically deny the truth of either assertion. The Government of India may flatter itself that its actions are always as just as they are benevolent, but a great many intelligent and well-disposed persons are of opinion that of late it has shown an utter disregard for fair and righteous dealing, and a callous indifference to the feelings of the people. Perhaps the deep resentment it has at last succeeded in rousing will create an unpleasant surprise in the official mind and disabuse it as to its ability to gauge the sentiments of the people.

But this is not an unexpected ebullition of feeling that we are now witnessing. Recent events had rendered it probable that sooner or later these pent-up feelings would burst forth. The demeanour of a certain class of Europeans and a great many officials has irritated and alienated the respectable classes of Indians, the charges of assault and murder against Englishmen which unfortunately of late have been pretty frequent, and the immunity from punishment which is the recognised fate of the offender, have roused bitter feelings in the minds of the people, the utter disregard for the wishes and the privileges of the people shown by attempts at legislation such as that on the jury question has swept away the prevailing notions of justice and fair-mindedness of the rulers, whilst the barefaced manner in which the interests of India have been subordinated to the selfish demands of Lancashire has excited bitter indignation, and a desire for some retaliation at all cost. That the people are loyal I do not for a moment doubt, but at the same time of late their loyalty has received too many rude shocks, and they are anything but contented with their position. For some time past there have been indications that they were not disposed to bear an injustice done to them without uttering a remonstrance, and now finding no heed paid to their remonstrance in a matter in which they were being gratuitously wronged, they are concerting plans of retaliation, with which the Government itself can find no fault, while no unprejudiced person could deny that they have good and substantial reasons for their proposed action. What makes the matter more iniquitous is that the Secretary of State for India has committed a distinct breach of faith with reference to the recent modification of the cotton duties. He had given a promise not to take further action till he had heard the Indian side of the question. But without waiting for the representations made by the mill-owners and Chambers of Commerce in India, he passed his final orders, thus showing an utter contempt for the people who are the victims of his indecent haste. For what is the result of his action? Whilst it grants a fairly large measure of relief to Lancashire, it needlessly handicaps the Indian mill industry, and the poorest of India's countless millions are taxed to the extent of fifty lakhs of rupees a year. And this simply to catch a few votes from Lancashire. So be it. But Lord George Hamilton must not complain if the people combine together and spoil his little plan.

Commenting in the April number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* upon Lord George Hamilton's answers to questions with reference to the invasion of Kafiristan, Dr. G. W. Leitner writes:—The answers show what little attention has been really paid to the questions put on both sides of the House. Even as late as the 3rd March, Lord G. Hamilton practically repeated the assurances of the 23rd February which had the effect of lulling the friends of the Kafirs in the Press and Parliament into a false security. Yet he had no real authority to contradict the announcement, published in the Indian papers, of the Afghan Commander-in-Chief that the campaign would be renewed with increased vigour in the first days of March. As a matter of fact, the slaughter began in the South and West of Kafiristan, the East having already been depopulated and over 16,000 of the survivors having already been carried thence into village slavery. If Lord Elgin had no better information than that with which he misled Lord G. Hamilton and caused him to mislead the House, the sooner he is recalled the better. However on the 6th March he *did* telegraph to England about the severe fighting and loss in the Ramgul Valley, and if Lord G. Hamilton then knew of it he ought at once to have communicated it to the House, and not waited till one of his supporters extracted the information from him on the 23rd. Nothing seems to have been done to stop the slaughter and enslavement of the Kafirs, and nothing, we fear, will be done.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE.

SPEECH BY MR. MANOMOHAN GHOSE.

We take the following extracts from the valuable speech delivered by Mr. Manomohan Ghose at the Poona Congress last December in support of the resolution praying for the separation of Judicial and Executive functions in India:

The Subjects Committee of this Congress having decided that I should move the fourth resolution, regarding the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice, I feel bound to carry out that direction. At the same time, I must confess that I cannot congratulate them on the wisdom of their choice in selecting me for this purpose. I have written and said so much on the subject of late years that I feel that, from one point of view, I am disqualified from discharging the duty satisfactorily, as I cannot say anything new. I am glad, however, that the principle which underlies the resolution is one regarding which there is not, and never has been, any serious difference of opinion.

A SOUND PRINCIPLE.

From the days of Lord Cornwallis down to the present time English administrators have repeatedly acknowledged the soundness of the principle for which we are contending. It is now exactly 100 years since the Government of Lord Cornwallis, in the preamble to a regulation of the Governor-General, publicly recorded that, in the opinion of the Government of India, it was exceedingly desirable that revenue officers and others performing Executive duties should not be called upon to try cases in which they have themselves been mixed up. The reform, however, was not then carried out, but in 1861, a few years after the Mutiny, when the Police Act was under discussion before the Legislative Council of the Governor-General of India, strenuous efforts were made by distinguished English officials to bring about this reform. It was on that occasion that no less eminent a member of the Civil Service than Sir Bartle Frere declared that the reform was one which must be carried out sooner or later, and that the only difficulties in the way were "prejudices of long standing." At that time Mr. Sconce, another distinguished member of the Civil Service and a judge of the Sudder Court, insisted upon the reform being then carried out, but he was put off with the assurance that in a very few years the measure which he advocated would be carried out.

"OUR CRIES REMAIN UNHEEDED."

At that time the National Congress was not even heard of, and I mention this fact in order to show that this is a reform which has all along been advocated by English officials and administrators themselves, and not by so-called revolutionaries like ourselves. Nothing, however, was done, and although since the establishment of this Congress we have repeatedly agitated for this small measure of reform, our cries have yet remained unheeded. As the President has told us only the other day, both Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross stated from their places in Parliament that it was exceedingly desirable that this reform should be carried out without further loss of time; but the difficulty which then pressed Lord Kimberley was, as he put it, solely based upon financial considerations. I regret to say that it is impossible for me or anyone who has studied the subject to accept this as a satisfactory explanation of the delay which has taken place in carrying out this reform. . . . It seems unreasonable that we should be put off on the ground of financial embarrassment, when there is a yearly surplus which ought undoubtedly to be devoted to improving the very administration which yields that surplus. (Applause.) But, after all, that is not the real objection.

THE BUGBEAR OF "PRESTIGE."

It is time that the responsible heads of the Government and the public at large should know and realise what the real objection of our opponents is. Not long ago a distinguished Indian civilian belonging to this Presidency—I think I ought to mention his name, because he made no secret of it, Mr. James, Commissioner in Sindh—wrote an article in an English magazine, in which he described the present system, which combines Judicial and Executive functions in one officer as "the mainstay of British power in India." (Shame.) The real objection then is the apprehension on the part of the Executive officers that their prestige will suffer if the reform we advocate is carried out. I cannot help thinking that the vice of our present administration is that justice is too often sacrificed at the altar of that bugbear known as prestige. (Hear, hear.) I have always understood that the real "mainstay of British power in India" was not in a system which tended to pervert justice, but in the belief that English courts dispensed even-handed justice. I am sure I express the opinion of everyone present here when I say that that is the true "mainstay of British power in India," and anything which tends to impair that confidence in the minds of the people strikes at the root of what is the true "mainstay of British power." (Cheers.) Not long ago I had occasion to point out to the present Secretary of State for India, who did me the honour of granting me an interview in London, that the general feeling among my countrymen was that justice was unattainable when the prestige of any public officer was involved. In saying so I believe I expressed the universal feeling of my countrymen on the subject. (Cheers.) I told him that the belief among the people of India was gaining ground that from the police constable drawing seven rupees a month up to Her Majesty's Secretary of State it was one continued ladder of prestige; that each officer was anxious to support the prestige of his own immediate subordinate even at the sacrifice of justice. Lord George Hamilton, who, I believe, is anxious to govern this country justly and with sympathy, no doubt realised the gravity of the observation; but he remarked that to a certain extent in the case of a service animated by an *esprit de corps* this state of things was almost unavoidable. When speaking in London on the subject I was cautious enough to speak of the feeling among my countrymen without expressing any opinion as to whether that feeling was well founded or not; but by a strange fatality I now find that just about the time I was speaking to Her Majesty's Secretary of State, Sir Charles Elliott was making a speech in Calcutta admitting and justifying the truth of my observation. He said, on the occasion of a public dinner, that the Government in India was always anxious not "to wash their dirty linen in public," and that it was absolutely necessary to maintain the prestige of a public servant publicly even if he had misconducted himself. (Shame.) This convinces me that I had accurately represented to the Secretary of State not only the true state of feeling among my countrymen, but that in reality the feeling was well founded. Well, it is that bugbear of prestige which, as Sir Richard Garth has pointed out, is in our way in this matter, and financial considerations are merely put forward because our opponents have not the courage to avow what the real objection is.

THE "CONNECTING LINK."

Not long ago a high Bengal official, whose name I am not entitled to divulge, because his communication was confidential, wrote to the Government of India to say that in his opinion it was undesirable to divest the magistrate of the district of his Judicial powers because he was "the connecting link" between the police and the Judiciary of his district; or in other words, because the magistrate of the district finds it convenient and necessary to pull the wires of the Judiciary from behind in the administration of criminal justice. This officer has very candidly let the cat out of the bag, and it is in this admission that we find the real secret of the opposition to this reform. It is time that our opponents should have the courage to declare publicly, as Mr. James declared, what the real objection is, and not take shelter behind supposed financial difficulties. Fortunately for us, the reform which we advocate is not one which originated with the Congress, nor is it one which affects the interests of any particular class of our people. There is no race question involved, nor does the advocacy of this reform suggest any alarming issues or arguments based upon the stability of the empire. The non-official European community are as much interested in this question as the people of the country, and even as regards the official classes I am glad to feel that the sympathies of nearly one half of the Indian Civil Servants themselves, namely, the members of the Judicial branch, are entirely on our side. (Cheers.) That being so, I feel that if we persistently agitate for this reform we shall, as the President observed, be within measurable distance of attaining the object we have in view.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, APRIL, 1896.

THE REAL MOTIVE POWER.

The *Madras Review*, we are glad to see, commences a second volume with fresh spirit. In its February number it applies a restrained, yet firm and vigorous, criticism to some recent official views regarding the progress of the Madras Presidency. The Government is, of course, entitled to set forth its conceptions of the state of the country and the causes influencing it. But it is encouraging to find that a local Reviewer has the nerve and the knowledge necessary to place before the public the different point of view of intelligent natives. This encouragement is all the more gratifying when the Reviewer confines himself strictly to fair argument, takes pains to discriminate judicially the objects of his blame and the weight of his censure, and even goes to the trouble to point out, what ought to be sufficiently obvious, that "a criticism of the official view of the progress of the country and a statement of the native view of such progress, however distasteful it might be, must not be regarded as an indication of irreconcilable hostility, but rather as an invitation to a careful consideration of the conclusions put forward." The judicious sobriety of the writer adds weight to his criticisms.

The document under review is the Blue-book entitled "Forty Years Progress of the Madras Presidency," recently issued from the Government Press under the name of the Hon. Dewan Bahadur S. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar, C.I.E., and introduced to the English public in a clever article by Mr. Rees, who was private secretary to Lord Connemara, and who was associated with Mr. Iyengar "in the inception and the execution of his work." The official team is a strong one, and a team driven by the late Governor himself. It is scarcely surprising, then, to find home rule painted in colours that contrast darkly with the colours representing English rule. "The Blue-book," says the writer in the *Madras Review*, "gives a dark picture of the Madras Presidency under the native rule, and a still darker picture under the Muhammadan rule. It skips lightly over the first half of the century under the English sway, and in great detail depicts as an era of progress and reform the period comprising the next forty years." What is really wanted, for a true conception of the historical development and the future prospects of the country, is a plain and unvarnished record of the facts, with deductions carefully drawn and expressed. An inadequate representation of the facts, with deductions framed on mere prejudices, however it may glorify or humiliate in the meantime, merely misleads home opinion, official and public, and is thoroughly mischievous. To expose such misrepresentation, we strongly hold, is to perform a solid service of incalculable value to all that are honestly interested in the good government of the Presidency and of the country generally.

The main interest lies within the English period. The English claimed the proprietary right in all the lands either in virtue of the right of conquest or as successors to Muhammadans, or under the Hindu law—a claim inevitably prejudicial to private rights and oppressive in practice. They claimed also the Sovereign's right to half the produce. As the *Madras Review* says:

> "It is to us a marvel how a nation pretending to be civilised and professing to annex territories with the one single object of relieving the oppressed subjects from the tyranny of their Sovereign, could still enforce certain rights, merely because they had been enforced by their predecessors under the sanction of a savage law in the days of anarchy and misrule which immediately preceded their conquest. That savage law is now fiercely denounced in Turkey. Yet that is the very basis of the English revenue system.
>
> "That the established share of our Government in the produce of the land was 50 per cent. is admitted in the Fifth Report. The other half of the gross produce, left to the cultivator, would scarcely be sufficient for the support of himself and his family after defraying the cultivation expenses and the interest on the capital required for cultivation. A far greater share would often be necessary. We have also to remember that the Government share of the gross produce was levied *in money*. In 1817, the Madras Revenue Board found that the conversion of such share alone of the produce was, in some districts, as high as 60 or 70 per cent. of the whole; or, with the falling in prices towards the latter part of the first half of the century such conversion very often exceeded the entire gross produce. Thus even under the efficient and honest administration, an assessment of half the gross produce meant the ruin of the rayats.
>
> "But 'the demand on the cultivator was, however, by no means confined to the established rates of land tax or rent.' As a matter of fact, the amount levied on each rayat was really 'left to be determined at the discretion of the European or native revenue officers.' For it was the practice to *compel* the rayat to occupy as much land and consequently to pay as much revenue as they deemed proportionate to his circumstances; he was not allowed on payment even of the high survey assessment fixed on each field to cultivate only those fields to which he gave the preference: his task was assigned to him;

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

he was constrained to occupy all such fields as were allotted to him by the revenue officers. And whether he cultivated them or not, he was, as Mr. Thackeray emphatically terms it, 'saddled with the rents of each.' If the rayat was driven by these oppressions to fly and seek a subsistence elsewhere, he was followed wherever he went and assessed at discretion or deprived of the advantages he might expect to derive from a change of residence."

This oppressive situation was the natural outcome of the fact that the constant increase of the revenue constituted the collector's "strongest claim on the Revenue Board and the Presidency for praise and promotion." Now what expedients were employed to squeeze the miserable rayat?

"It was laid down in the instructions of collectors that they should not encourage the rayats to expect any remission; that, if the crop produced even less than the seed sown, the full rent should still be demanded; and if the rayat be unable to pay, the deficiency was required to be assessed *on the village*. And if the village could not pay, *on a neighbouring village*, limiting the re-assessment to a certain proportion lest it should injure next year's revenue."

Under such monstrous circumstances what sort of morality was likely to be developed in the rayat? Let one of the collectors tell his experience:

"The enormity of the land tax and the corruption of the subordinate officials have invariably tended to a natural progression to extortion on the one hand and to moral debasement on the other; violence, corruption, artifice, on the one hand are met by deceit, hypocrisy, and cunning on the other. What the one tries to extort the other endeavours to withhold. And universal degradation of character ensues. The basest principles of action are substituted for honesty and truth."

Every incitement to industry or improvement was crushed out; and what the Government locust left to the wretched rayat the rapacious underlying caterpillar ate up. Worse than all that has yet been stated were the revelations of the Torture Commission. There can be no question that "torture was applied openly in the presence of Europeans, without any attempt at concealment, and justified as being in accordance with Government orders." The practice in police cases was too vile for reproduction here. The principal tortures then in vogue in such cases form a sufficiently abominable and barbarous catalogue, not easily to be outdone in times of Muhammadan or Hindu ascendency; a record of villainy not readily to be expiated by generations of beneficent rule. As to revenue cases:

"The descriptions of violence commonly in vogue for revenue and other purposes, which were referred to in the course of this enquiry were as follows: 'Keeping a man in the sun; preventing his going to meals, or other calls of nature; confinement; preventing cattle from going to pasture by shutting them up in the house; quartering a peon on the defaulter, who is obliged to pay him daily wages; the use of the kittee; Anundal; squeezing the crossed fingers with the hands; pinches on the thighs; slaps; blows with fist or whip; running up and down; twisting the ears; making a man sit on the soles of his feet with bricklats behind his knees; putting a low caste man on the back; striking two defaulter's heads against each other, or tying them together by their back hair; placing in the stocks; tying the hair of the head to a donkey's or buffalo's tail; placing a necklace of bones, or other degrading or disgusting materials, round the neck; and, occasionally, though very rarely, more severe discipline still."

The practice of torture as a means for the realisation of the Government revenue continued, though in a mitigated form, down to 1855. The record is grievously shocking to Englishmen who, in these days, may well wonder with Sir John Kaye "how anything of the kind could ever have existed." At the same time, it is an element of the Administration that must come into the historical account; and the substance of it, as well as what the Madras Board declared to be "no exaggerated description" of the general situation, may be conveniently read in the notes to p. 225 of Kaye's "History of the Administration of the East India Company." "The policy followed towards Indian trade completed the ruin." The cotton duties are the merest bagatelle in comparison with the selfish and oppressive treatment of India by England in commercial relations during the first generation of the century. "The avowed principle was not free trade, but a selfish desire to benefit the English trade," and also the West Indian slave colonies and America.

These grave blots of administration are fairly pointed out by the hostile critic, and when he says with studied moderation that they were "simply disgraceful," a fair-minded Englishman can only remain dumb and ashamed. "Since the middle of the century," however, "there has undoubtedly been great progress":

"The great reforms in the internal administration of the country referred to in the Blue-book are the reduction of the land assessments, the construction of roads, railways, canals, the organisation of the police force, the prohibition of the employment of torture in the collection of the revenue; the great progress of local government is also sympathetically referred to. How was it, then, that during the first half of the century there was utter stagnation, while during the next forty years there was such remarkable progress? On this phenomena the Blue-book throws no light, and it was not, perhaps, intended to throw any."

The writer in the *Madras Review* supplies the omission. He points to the abject servility and helplessness of the people at the time when the English took possession; the effects of prolonged oppression in discouraging them from asserting the elementary rights of civilised existence; the disastrous results of the union in one person of the powers of magistrate, police officer, and taxgatherer; the bureaucratic ideas of the governing classes; the lack of education and of objects of reasonable aspiration. "Progress was impossible so long as high appointments in the services were refused to the Indians on account of their race disqualifications, so long as they were treated as helots unfit to be associated with the Englishmen in the administration of the country." But such appointments implied education. The efforts of Lord William Bentinck and Macaulay received a decided support and impulse to success from the reform agitation of the early thirties in England, which was directed to the condition of India by the protests of discerning and sympathetic Anglo-Indians. "It is instructive to consider the attitude generally of the Anglo-Indians towards this policy of Lord William Bentinck of admitting the natives to the higher grades in the service, and of disseminating modern culture among the upper classes with a view to their admission to such higher grades. Their attitude was one of bitter hostility, only equalled, or perhaps surpassed, by their attitude towards one who about fifty years later attempted to enforce the principles first publicly

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

avowed in Lord William Bentinck's time." Lord William Bentinck, on his return to England, declared, with perfect justice, "that it was only by enabling the natives of India to bring their complaints and grievances before the authorities and the public of England, and by persuading the 'globe-trotters' to report to their countrymen at home the nature of the circumstances of India, that the shameful apathy and indifference of Great Britain to India could be roused, and that the desired amelioration could be accomplished." Then, as now, the official apologists prophesied evil—the weakening of the governing hands, the increase of excitement in India, the stirring of discontent dangerous to peace. It is unnecessary to trace the operations of the London British India Society, the British India Committee, the India Reform Association, and the East India Association, the predecessors of the British Committee of the National Congress; or to follow the action of the various Native Associations in the Presidencies. We have said enough to point the conclusion of the writer in the *Madras Review* that "*it was not till the native and the English public opinion practically forced these reforms*" of the past forty years "*on the Indian Services that they were really carried out.*" The writer is careful to acknowledge the value of the sympathy and helpfulness of individual members of the Services; his condemnation falls upon the Services generally.

"In issuing the "Forty Year's Progress," the Government of Madras are only continuing the tradition of their predecessors. Everything that comes from the manufactory of the Government Press to extol the Indian Services, we would entreat the English public to accept with caution. The foundations of future progress have been well and truly laid. It is now impossible to stop the importation of the daily English papers, journals, and books into India. It is equally impossible to check the progress of English education. Secret and irresponsible government is then doomed. Privilege and monopoly must therefore cease to exist. Will Englishmen fight for them, or *will they accept the noble task of guiding India's tottering steps to equality?*"

There can be no question, happily, as to the good intentions of the English public. The misfortune is that, unless some strong and immediate pressure is applied, we are content to assume that everything is going on well in India; and the danger is that, when the stimulus to attention goads us keenly, we may act with more haste and vigour than knowledge and discretion. The public interest in Indian affairs may confidently be said to be largely on the increase, and with interest will come knowledge. At no time has it ever been more important that we should instruct ourselves in the current developments of Indian life and aspiration, so as to exercise a healthy influence, through wise methods, on the government and administration of the country.

CONGRESS ADDRESSES.[1]

When the history of parliamentary representation in India comes to be written, as we believe it will be written at some not far distant day, justice will no doubt be done to the unique character and importance of the Indian National Congress. While the list of the resolutions passed at the last Congress, resembling in so many of its items the resolutions of previous meetings, reminds us how difficult is the task of moving a bureaucratic Government, a rapid survey of the Presidential Addresses during the first decade of the Congress brings home to us the immense increase in the influence of that body, and its ever growing value as a bond of union between Indians of all classes and religions. Little more than ten years ago the first national assembly ever convened in India was attended by seventy-two representatives selected by various associations. Its avowed object—the promotion of national unity independent of all prejudices of class and race—was received with derision by unsympathetic observers, who did not hesitate to stigmatize the proposed union as impossible and denounce its purposes as disloyal, notwithstanding the most sincere professions of unswerving fidelity to British rule. In spite of angry opposition and contempt the Congress has steadily grown, until in December of last year the representatives had increased to sixteen hundred, although the numbers had been reduced several years previously to facilitate the progress of business. The charge of disloyalty needed no refutation. The very birth of the Congress was in itself the outcome of the firm belief on the part of our Indian fellow-subjects in the essential fairness of the British electorate, if only their interest could be roused; its continuance and development illustrate their conviction that constitutional agitation is the best means of obtaining redress of grievances. The expression of the national discontent at specific wrongs by such frank methods was alone sufficient evidence of their confident acquiescence in British rule in the main. None saw more clearly than the educated Indians who conceived the idea of the National Congress that only under British rule was such a scheme possible. It is in fact, as Mr. Mehta pointed out, no mere parasitic growth, but the direct outcome of ancient Indian institutions and British influence combined. The idea of representation is as natural to the village community, and to the caste, as it was to the Mark and the ecclesiastical system that gave England her Parliament. The British occupation has tended steadily to break down the barriers of caste and religion, in spite of the unworthy principle of "*Divide et impera*" which has been sometimes advocated, and more often employed, as the only safe principle of government in India. On the other hand, the abstract theory of a wider basis for the government of India has been approved by Viceroys and ministers of both parties alike; both have refused to extend to the theory more than a very grudging recognition in practice. Few probably foresaw the rapid development of the appreciation of representative institutions in India, or the ease with which the spirit of nationality would in a few years remove so many of the obstacles to combination offered by differences of religion and caste. It is not altogether surprising, therefore, that a right freely acknowledged in principle should after ten years' agitation have been churlishly withheld. When the strength of the opposition offered by the

[1] "Inaugural Addresses by Presidents of the Indian National Congress, with Mr. Charles Bradlaugh's Speech." Compiled by Dinker Vishnu Gokhale, B.A., Bombay.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

official and military departments is estimated, when it is remembered how difficult a task it is to rouse the British elector to take an interest even in matters that affect him directly, and how slowly reform has progressed in England, our shame for the ungenerous response to the demands of India will be mingled with astonishment at the progress made towards the formation of a combined Indian people and representative institutions.

It was no ordinary task that the promoters of the Congress set themselves to face. Hindus, Mussulmans, Parsis, Christians, have been united by the idea of a common nationality, and work in perfect harmony. It is true that on social questions the difference of standpoint threatened to produce discord, but by a wise provision such topics were almost from the very first relegated to a separate meeting, and with the sole exception of the much exaggerated difference between the Social Conference and the political organisation at Poona the two congresses have worked with a noticeable absence of friction. Differences of creed, race, and language have been overcome by community of interests and aims, citizenship of a common empire, and a share in common burdens. The feeling of common nationality which gave rise to the Congress has received a great impetus from its rapid and robust growth. How far the new idea has superseded old prejudices may be seen from Rai Bahadur Charlu's Presidential address in 1891, where, in view of the proposal to hold a Congress in London, he discussed the wisdom of relaxing the religious prohibition against a voyage over sea, and said: "But if the worst [*i.e.*, "loss of caste] should happen there is already the "beginning of a Congress-caste fundamentally "based on Hinduism." The Indian Parliamentary Party and the British Committee are the allies and representatives in England of the National Congress, and proofs of the energy with which the work of reform is being pressed on at headquarters. All the energy that can be displayed will be needed, for the abuses of Indian administration are many, and the forces marshalled by custom and self-interest to oppose progress are strong; since these include the army and the official class whose privileges are the first to be threatened by the most pressing measure, financial reform. So long as government by Company existed the jealousy felt by Parliament and the necessity for a renewal of the Charter every thirty years were good guarantees against oppression. Now there is no real control by Parliament either of finance or any other department of the Indian Government. The Indian Budget, involving an expenditure of nearly twenty millions sterling more than the income of the United Kingdom at the beginning of the present reign, is still passed as a matter of form by the House of Commons, although not a taxpayer in India outside the Supreme Council has the slightest voice in the matter. To please the army, wars are carried on in the imaginary interests of the Empire and British "prestige," the Indian taxpayer is saddled with the burden of the expense, and scarcely a protest is heard in Parliament. In all Indian affairs the Secretary of State for India is guided by his official Council, and his decisions are supported, as the opinion of a specialist, by his colleagues in the Government, which is backed by the majority in the House of Commons. Such was the process by which the scheme for a system of peasant banks on the German plan to relieve the starving rayat was suppressed, although it had received the approval of the Bombay Government, Sir Evelyn Baring the Finance Minister, and other leading authorities. This is the means whereby such measures as Sir Charles Elliott's suppression of the jury system in Bengal are rendered possible. Hence it is that the unjust, illogical, and tyrannical concentration of judicial and executive functions in the same hands has been allowed to perpetuate in India a most glaring violation of every principle of equity and common sense, and a most satirical commentary on the traditional British love of fair play. So incurious is Parliament in reference to the methods and proceedings of the India Office that it has even allowed its own resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations to be disregarded.

That there is, however, an increasing interest in Indian affairs amongst Englishmen, a clearer perception of the poverty of the Indian taxpayer, and of the duties entailed upon us by the possession of our Indian empire, is due to the efforts of the Indian National Congress and its friends in England. Ten years is but a short period in Parliamentary history, and even if nothing had been achieved beyond the consolidation of the position of the Congress, that alone would be a reason for sanguine hopes as to the future. But something more has been done—little perhaps compared with what remains to be done, but much considering the short period of usefulness as yet enjoyed by the Congress and the difficulties that block the way. It is impossible even for the official opposition to neglect the opinion of a body composed of "representatives of every class and "creed, each elected by, and a representative of, the "whole mixed community of the place he represents, "on the basis of common interest and nationality." Many an official job has been prevented by the knowledge that enlightened criticism awaited it. Sir Charles Elliott's proclamation withdrawing trial by jury in serious cases from the courts of Bengal had to be cancelled within a year. The Jury Bill of last year was withdrawn in deference to the strong opposition organised mainly by the Congress. Finally, some concessions have been obtained in the matter of finance and of representation. It is not a great boon perhaps to have obtained, this Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, viewed in the light of past experience of such Commissions; but it indicates the awakening of the British public to the serious and critical state of things existing in India, and it is hard to believe that with the memory of the cotton duties still fresh in the minds of a large section of the community something will not be done to remedy the present infamous inequality of burdens and to charge Imperial revenue with the expenditure on Imperial projects. The provision made by Lord Cross's Indian Councils Bill for elected native representatives on the Legislative Councils is the most important and far-reaching measure yet passed in connexion with the reform of Indian government. It is true that the rules which were framed for the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

carrying out of that Act amounted to an ungracious withdrawal in part of the boon already granted, and that the Act of 1861 removes all financial questions beyond the discussion of the Councils. But the recognition of the right to elective representation is not to be underestimated—a right which, to quote Mr. Webb's words, cost other nations centuries of toil and effort. Already the Congress has done good work, and more remains to be done—much, we believe, in the immediate future. And although what has been achieved has been largely in despite of the authorities, we believe with Mr. Pherozshah Mehta that "all the great forces of English life and "society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if "slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connexion "of England and India a blessing to themselves and "to the whole world for countless generations." The great obstacle is the ignorance and apathy of the electorate, and that the Congress is doing much to dispel.

BUDDHIST LORE.[1]

Here is the first volume of a new series, which promises to be of great interest. Undaunted in his labours to bring home to the English-speaking world a knowledge of the religions of the East, and still unwearied after the superintendence of the publication of half a hundred volumes, Professor Max Müller deserves much credit for tackling the production of yet another set of Eastern religious works. In his editorial preface, he enters into some account of certain of his difficulties, and even defends himself from personal aspersions that might well have been spared. "The fact is," he explains, "that during all the years which I devoted to the superintending of the publication of the fifty volumes of the Sacred Books of the East, I have not had the smallest addition to my income. I was relieved by the University of Oxford from the duty of delivering my public lectures, so that I might devote my time to this large literary undertaking brought out by our University Press. . . . . I have never claimed any credit for the sacrifices which I have made, both in time and in money, for the objects which were near and dear to my heart." The disclaimer ought not to have been necessary. More than that, the immense service thus rendered to learning and to popular knowledge deserves, on the contrary, some distinctive token of public recognition. It is a great pleasure to us to acknowledge also the timely and effective assistance that has been rendered in starting this series by Chulâlankarana, King of Siam, who, "being desirous that the true teaching of the Buddha should become more widely known in Europe," was "graciously pleased to promise that material support without which the publication of these translations would have been impossible." It is to be hoped that the interest of the public in this work will encourage his Majesty to continue his liberality.

The object of the publication of these translations is undoubtedly one of material importance. "If," says Professor Max Müller, "the members of the principal religions of the world wish to understand one another, to bear with another, and possibly to recognise certain great truths which, without being aware of it, they share in common with one another, the only solid and sound foundation for such a religious peace-movement will be supplied by a study of the Sacred Books of each religion." This, of course, is quite true. At the same time, it must be frankly acknowledged that such a "religious peace-movement" must for a long time be confined to a chosen few, and that knowledge of each other's doctrines is not all that is needed in order to consummate a peace even on a basis of tolerance. When one considers the keenness of the edge of religious difference in England, where the means of knowledge of the different religious views have been ample for centuries, the ardour of one's hopes is sensibly cooled. Still it is well to remove obvious difficulties, and to do what can be done for the eventual triumph of sense and reason.

The *Gâtakamâlâ*, or "Garland of Birth Stories," belongs to the Canon of the Northern Buddhists. For Europe, it was discovered by Mr. Brian H. Hodgson, to whom it was communicated by his old Patan monk. Professor Kern, appreciating its great literary merits, devoted immense labour to the production of an edition of the Sanskrit text, which Professor Max Müller says "is not only an *editio princeps*, but the text as restored by him will probably remain the final text." The present translation has been made by Professor Speyer, of Groningen, who has but seldom departed from the text of Kern. The collection is a Sanskrit rendering of thirty-four *Gâtakas*, or homilies, ascribed to Arya *Sûra*, who selected them from the old and traditional store of *Gâtaka* tales. The date of Arya *Sûra* is not definitely fixed. "Prof. Kern was induced," says Professor Speyer, "to place *Sûra* approximately in the century of Kâlidâsa and Varâhamihira, but equally favourable circumstances may be supposed to have existed a couple of centuries earlier. I think, however, he is posterior to the author of the Buddhacarita."

This, then, is a collection of homilies, each tale being treated after the fashion of a religious discourse. The text in each case consists of a simple prose sentence of ethical or religious purpose, which introduces the story and receives illustration by the story. The avowed object of the narrative is to rouse and invigorate the true faith in the mind of the reader; and the lesson turns on some event in a former existence of the Buddha. The elaborate prose is interspersed with clever verse. Let Professor Speyer describe the qualities of the composition:

"It has perhaps been the most perfect writing of its kind. Its verses and artful prose are written in the purest Sanskrit, and charm the reader by the elegance of their form and the skill displayed in the handling of a great variety of metres, some of which are rarely to be met with elsewhere, and are sometimes adorned with the additional qualities of difficult and refined rhymes and the like. Apparently *Sûra*, to whom the *Gâtakamâlâ* is ascribed, was a poet richly gifted by Nature, whose talent must have been developed by thorough

[1] "The Sacred Books of the Buddhists." Edited by F. Max Müller. Volume I.: The *Gâtakamâlâ*, by Arya *Sura*; translated by J. S. Speyer. (London: Henry Frowde.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and extensive literary studies. Above all, I admire his moderation. Unlike so many other Indian masters in the art of literary composition, he does not allow himself the use of embellishing apparel and the whole luxuriant *mise en scène* of Sanskrit alaṁkâra beyond what is necessary for his subject. His flowery descriptions, his long and elaborate sermons, his elegant manner of narration, are always in harmony with the scheme of the whole or the nature of the contents. Similarly, in the choice of his metres, he was guided by stylistic motives in accordance with the tone and sentiment required at a given point of the narrative."

The introductory text or maxim is repeated at the end as a conclusion of the story, and usually there are added, by way of epilogue, other moral lessons that may be illustrated by the story, or different subjects of religious discourses in connection with which the story may be turned to instructive account. Professor Speyer is of opinion that these epilogues are accretions posterior to *Sûra*; but he has had the good sense to translate them and print them in full.

The following remarks of Professor Max Müller throw useful light upon the principle and purpose of the tales:—

"This class of stories is peculiar to Buddhism; for, although the idea that every man had passed through many existences before his birth on earth, and will pass through many more after his death, was, like most Buddhist theories, borrowed from the Brâhmans, yet its employment for teaching the great lessons of morality seems to have been the work of Buddha and his pupils. In addition to this there was another theory, likewise Brâhmanic in its origin, but again more fully developed for practical purposes by the Buddhists, that of *Karma*, a firm belief that an unbroken chain of cause and effect binds all existences together. The great problems of the justice of the government of the world, of the earthly sufferings of the innocent, and the apparent happiness of the wicked, were to the Indian mind solved once for all by the firm conviction that what we experience here is the result of something that has happened before, that there is an unbroken heredity in the world, and that we not only benefit by, but also suffer from, our ancestors. In order fully to understand the drift of the *Gâtakas* we must, however, bear in mind one more article of the Buddhist faith, namely, that though ordinary mortals remember nothing of their former existences beyond the fact that they did exist, which is involved in the very fact of their self-consciousness, highly enlightened beings have the gift of recalling their former vicissitudes. . . . It seems to have been the constant habit of the historical Buddha, Buddha *Sâkya-muni*, to explain to his disciples things that were happening by things that had happened countless ages before. Those lessons seem certainly to have impressed his hearers, after they once believed that what they had to suffer here on earth was not the result of mere chance, but the result of their own former deeds or the deeds of their fellow-creatures, that they were, in fact, paying off a debt which they had contracted long ago. It was an equally impressive lesson that whatever good they might do on earth would be placed to their account in a future life, because the whole world was one large system in which nothing could ever be lost, though many of the links of the chain of cause and effect might escape human observation or recollection."

Of course, it is difficult for ourselves to enter fully into the Buddhist views of the world; but at any rate Professor Max Müller thinks it necessary to warn the readers of these stories that "they must not imagine that highly-educated men among the Buddhists were so silly as to accept the *Gâtaka* as ancient history." "A *Gâtaka*," he points out, "was not much more than what a parable is with us; and as little as Christians are expected to accept the story of Lazarus resting in Abraham's bosom as a matter of fact were the Buddhists bound to believe that Buddha, as an individual or as an historical person, had formerly been a crow or a hare." The whole volume of stories is extremely interesting and instructive, and Christian readers that are unfamiliar with Buddhist morality and religion will find it full of surprises that ought to be of an agreeable quality.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

We reproduce below General Sir Neville Chamberlain's important letter on Kafiristan which was read at the recent Conference at Westminster Palace Hotel. The letter was addressed to the secretary to the Aborigines Protection Society:

Lordswood, Southampton.

Dear Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 7th inst. I beg to assure you that the object for which your conference is to be held has my heartfelt sympathy, and I hope it may succeed in arousing the minds of the Government and the public generally to the urgency for such steps being taken as may yet be possible to avert the renewal of the invasion of Kafiristan by the troops of the Amír of Afghanistan; or, that if the Government considers that it cannot arrest a continuance of the invasion, it will, at all events, promptly and vigorously avail itself of every means within its power to mitigate the horrors which are the sure accompaniment of Afghan conquest; which are the more terrible when the vanquished, as infidels, are considered to be outside the pale of human mercy.

Who could have supposed a few years ago that the necessity would ever arise for Englishmen to have to assemble to plead the cause of a race whose history is lost in past ages, and whose heroic courage and love of independence have, up to within the last few months, preserved their homes from invasion by the implacable foe which has for centuries past encircled their territory?

Ever since the mission of Mountstuart Elphinstone to the Shah of Cabul in 1808 the Government of India and many persons of European nations have taken an interest in the race occupying the valleys geographically known as Kafiristan. This interest has naturally gone on increasing as the British frontier and influence have extended beyond the Indus, and we have been placed in a better position for acquiring more trustworthy information in regard to them. Such means as have been within our power have been employed to bring us into friendly communication with these people, and so far did we succeed in gaining their confidence and lead them to trust in our friendship, that some two years ago they allowed a British officer to enter their territory as a welcome guest. Indeed, it was considered to be the mission of the Government of India to afford such political and moral protection to the Kafir race as might be within its power, for it was felt that no national heroism, however great, could enable them to continue to successfully resist the attacks of their Muhammadan neighbours, now that these latter were armed with the weapons of modern warfare, whilst the Kafirs remained almost un-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

possessed of firearms of any description, and had to rely, as of old, on bows and arrows and knives.

The views entertained by the Government of India upon the subject of Kafiristan were well known to the Amír, and His Highness at that time acted as if he was ready to meet its wishes.

Such was the position which the two Governments held towards each other until our intervention in the affairs of Chitral assumed the appearance of our intention to retain possession of that State. That measure was for various reasons most distasteful to the Amír, as also to the general feelings of the neighbouring Muhammadan tribes, and our relations at Cabul became less cordial.

In the autumn of 1893 Mr. (now Sir Henry) Durand was sent on a mission to Cabul to settle the Chitral and other outstanding questions, and this afforded an opportunity to the Amír to press for British acceptance of his claim to include Kafiristan as coming within his sphere of jurisdiction—a right, in one sense, more precious to His Highness than that to which he acceded in regard to Chitral.

Every previous ruler of Afghanistan, and every Afghan zealot, has always had at heart the conquest of the Kafir race, and now has come the time when everything appears to them opportune for the accomplishment of that long unfulfilled desire. The bloody work of conquest has, we are told already proceeded apace. Gold medals are said to have been presented by the Amír to the successful generals, and the subjugation of the unhappy people is to be proceeded with as soon as the season will permit.

It is true that we have been assured through the Press, on the authority of an Englishman lately returned from Cabul, that little was talked of in that capital as to what was taking place in Kafiristan: whilst it was stated that the object of the Amír was merely to open up a new route to his province of Badakshan for his own purposes, as also to assist the English to defend India: and that it was therefore better to do such work in time of peace than to wait until the emergency arose. Those who can credit such a pretext must indeed be easily deceived. My own conviction is that these reasons were assigned by the Amír in order to throw the British public off its guard, until such time as the desired end was accomplished: after which interposition would no longer be of any avail.

I do not believe that the people of England can form any idea of the deeds of an outrage that have already been committed during the successes said to have been organised by the Amír's forces: and I believe that there will be neither the inclination nor the power on the part of his officers to repress in the future a repetition of the same acts of cruelty and shame. There is no abomination known to man that will not find vent during the subjection of the unhappy race now called upon to defend all that is most cherished in this life by men, women, and children.

In support of my belief as to what will occur should the soldiery and their accompanying Ghazis be left to work their will, full confirmation is to be found in what took place a few years ago when the Hazara tribe had to succumb to the Afghan troops. The men were mercilessly slaughtered after a brave but vain resistance. As to the women and children we are told by an English surgeon who was in the service of the Amír that Cabul was overstocked by them. Neither age nor position, nor any family tie afforded any protection to these prizes of Afghan conquest, and for as long as life remains to these unfortunate creatures they will continue to be at the mercy of their owners. If such was the tyranny imposed on a tribe which acknowledged the Muhammadan prophet, what clemency can the people of Kafiristan expect? It is true that the people of Hazara are of the Sheeah persuasion, and as such are not accepted by their Sunnee co-religionists as of the orthodox faith—and consequently they are despised by the Pathan and Afghan races.

Although I have felt compelled to denounce the acts of a nation professing the Muhammadan religion, I must affirm that I have done so without being in any way prejudiced against the Afghans on account of their faith. Indeed, I believe I have the right to say that their Prophet severely forbids and pronounces future condign punishment to every one of his followers who approaches the Almighty in his name, who shall commit the inhuman acts now permitted to go unchecked in the dominion of the Amír of Afghanistan.

Our justification for urging upon His Highness to put an end to such atrocities rests upon the grounds that we placed him upon the throne: that we have guaranteed him against foreign aggression: that we have maintained him in power by our influence and moral support: that we have granted him a large annual subsidy, and that it is the British Government which has equipped his military forces.

What more could a great power do for a neighbouring Sovereign. And who can deny that such acts of friendship do not confer upon England the right to insist upon the repression of cruel wrongs which have as yet cried out in vain for redress?

I have now given my reasons for wishing success to the cause you advocate, and I can only trust that in any engagements entered into by our Government with the Amír in regard to Kafiristan, no promise can be accepted as valid until it has been carried into effect.—Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Neville Chamberlain,
General.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

General dissatisfaction seems to pervade all classes in India at the manner in which the cotton duties have been finally re-arranged. No one can be surprised at this for the net results of this re-arrangement are to relieve the rich of taxation to the extent of 37 lakhs and to impose on the poor a further burden of at least 10½ lakhs, and this distinctly unjustifiable measure is virtually asserted by the Indian officials to have been forced on them by the India Office here.

How this latest development was actually evolved it is not easy to realize. First under dire financial pressure, the Indian Government obtained permission to put cotton goods on the same footing as

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

other imported articles and levy on them the same import duty as paid by these, viz., one of 5 per cent. *ad valorem*. That these goods had been originally excluded from the schedule of duty-paying imports was a scandal, and characteristic of the manner in which ministers and officials here truckle to powerful interests. They had truckled to Manchester as others truckle to the parsons and the publicans. But heedful of the outcry Manchester would be sure to raise at this small act of simple justice, and in order to anticipate any charge of protection, the authorities settled that yarns above 20's whether imported or manufactured in India should pay a 5 per cent. duty. Time passed, and the election being at hand the Tories went about sympathizing with the cruel injustice (!) done by the imposition of the 5 per cent. duties and expatiating on the great things that they would do for Manchester if they were returned to power.

They were returned to power, and then—they began with one accord to make excuses. Still they had said so much, especially Lord George Hamilton, that in common decency they had to do something.

Now the position of affairs was this; in the matter of cloths made with 20's and other lower count yarns, there was absolutely no competition. With cheaper labour and abundant short-stapled cotton, quite suited to 20's and lower counts, on the spot in India, England could not compete with India, and in all the years between 1882 and 1895, during which the trade was perfectly free, England never exported any appreciable quantity of these qualities of goods, save only where one special denomination, viz, drills, was concerned, and as these required a longer and stronger fibre than India produces, India could not turn these out at a profit, and so even in this one minor class there was no competition.

On the other hand in printed and coloured goods, of no matter what qualities, there was no appreciable competition, because there was not one single printing mill or dye-works in India.

Again in cloths woven from 30's and higher counts there was no appreciable competition. Indian cotton does not run to these, and the entire trade was practically in England's hands.

It was in cloths made from yarns between 20's and 30's that alone any real competition between the products of the looms of England and India existed; towards the lower limit India, towards the middle and right on to the higher limit England had the best of it.

Whilst the India Office was looking about anxiously to discover what it could decently do, by way of a sop to Manchester, the latter started the proposition that India, paying only on yarns, while they paid on the cloth, was really protected to the extent of 1½ per cent. The way they put it was somewhat as follows: England exports to India Rs.100 worth of cloth, and on that pays a 5 per cent duty, viz. Rs.5. An Indian manufacturer pays a 5 per cent. duty on Rs.70 worth of yarn, viz., Rs.3·8, but out of this yarn he produces Rs.100 worth of cloth, on which he will only have paid an excise of 3½ per cent., viz., Rs.3 8, against the 5 per cent. Manchester pays.

This was a very plausible argument, and though when account was taken of the fact that the Indian mills had to pay duty on machinery, china clay, and other necessary imported stores, it seemed clear that India's gain could not exceed ½ per cent., if it existed at all, still to settle the bugbear of protection, the Indian mill-owners were quite willing that in the case of all English cloths which their goods competed with, the duty should be reduced to 3½ per cent., while India continued to pay 5 per cent. on the yarn she used whether home-made or imported.

Of course the only statesmanlike manner of dealing with the question would have been, while leaving the duties on all the English goods untouched, to abolish the yarn duties and place a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* excise duty on all cloths into whose composition any yarn of higher count than 20's entered, turned out from the Indian mills. This would have imposed no extra burthen on the poor, nor would it have involved any relinquishment of duties paid by the rich, a relinquishment wholly indefensible looking to the conditions that prevail in India. The small surplus, which has been made the pretext for the relinquishment of taxation already referred to, was only the accidental result of a temporary fluctuation in the exchange, just as likely as not to be followed six months hence by an equal or greater deficit. Even were this not so, while the starving millions in India pay a 4,000 per cent. tax on their salt (Rs.2·8 a maund on what can be produced for one anna a maund), while the famine insurance fund is starved, while the resources of all Provincial Governments, on which the welfare of the people so greatly depends, are constantly confiscated for Imperial purposes, while public works' developments are stunted and innumerable administrative reforms of the greatest urgency have to remain in abeyance, it is not to providing a sop for Manchester, but to ameliorating the condition of the Indian masses that any improvement in India's finances should have been devoted.

This statesmanlike course did not apparently suit the India Office—something had to be done for Lancashire, and one can therefore understand why the course above indicated, the only right and proper course, was rejected. But why the sensible compromise proposed by Bombay, by which Manchester's payments on all cloths which Indian mills also turn out should be reduced to 3½ per cent. while the mills should continue to pay 5 per cent. on their yarns, should also be rejected, is very hard to understand.

Supposed protection of Indian cotton goods as against English manufactures was the sole pretext for any re-arrangement. The Bombay proposal completely swept away, indeed, more than swept away, any possible protection of the nature alleged, and, what was more, it involved a specially kindly concession to Manchester, other British manufacturers of articles which have to compete with Indian local manufactures gaining no such reduction of the 5 per cent. duty. Here was a special favour to Manchester, and a complete estoppel to the cry about protection. What more could even Lord George Hamilton desire?

Why he did it no mere mortal could understand—but what he did was this; desiring apparently to exemplify the saying that it is always the unexpected that happens, he suddenly descended like a god from his car on the Government of India and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

compelled them, (so at any rate we read between the lines of the Council speeches,) against their better judgment, to abolish the duties on all yarns and impose an import and excise duty of 3½ per cent. on all cloths English and Indian.

It is incomprehensible; the only pretext for a re-arrangement was the protection afforded by the old arrangement. What has been done? The duties on all printed and coloured goods and all fine goods made with 30's and higher counts, in which there was no protection, have been lowered to 3½ per cent. to please Manchester, and save the pockets of the rich who alone use these fabrics, while *per contra*, Lord G. Hamilton has put a duty of 3½ per cent. on cloths made from yarns of 20's and lower counts, hitherto free, and has thus added 10½ lakhs to the burthens of the Indian poor, many thousands of whom are this day actually starving and millions on millions of whom are ever on the verge of starvation.

What is more, by abolishing the duty on yarns, Lord G. Hamilton has granted protection to the hand-loom weavers and to the power-looms situated in Native States (and between them they use nearly two-thirds of all the yarn used in India) to the extent of at least 3½ per cent., and all this by way of doing away with any protection.

It is incredible — clearly there has been some oversight. Many here are striving to have the whole matter reconsidered and we cannot but think that Lord George Hamilton, when he comes to review the question in all its aspects, will see his way, at any rate, to exempting cloths entirely composed of 20's and lower counts from all duties, whether of import or excise—which would relieve the new arrangements of at least one most indefensible feature. A. O. H.

THE SCOPE OF THE "MANDATE."

[From an Anglo-Indian Correspondent.]

The Cotton Duties crisis has blown over for the present, but the bitterness remains. Though Lancashire is tranquillised, the Indian Empire is not appeased, nor will it be. Few of our public men here have any due conception of the depth and breadth of the disgust and indignation amongst all classes in India, because, first, of the exemption of cotton goods from the tariff of 1894; next, though in less degree, because of the excise imposed when, in 1894, those goods were subjected to customs duties; and now, with five-fold more intensity, because of a one-sided inequitable revision of the tariff having been forced through the Supreme Legislative Council in the interests of a small but powerful class of the present Ministry's supporters. This latter count of the indictment is emphasised by the fact that the change was made before the Secretary of State had taken time to consider those protests and explanations from India for which he had promised to wait. As to the prevalence of this grave accusation, one need only quote—from amongst scores of instances—the following from the *Bombay Gazette*: "There is no more hesitation in public assemblies than in the press to charge the Secretary of State with breach of faith in having, despite his solemn promises, decided upon the policy to be pursued without having looked into the case put forward on behalf of India." As to the general arguments against the mode of this enforced "final" adjustment, those have been fully set forth in these columns; but, in order that busy public men may have a chance to realise the intensity of discontent aroused by this fiscal *coup d'état*, would I again refer them to full reports of the public gatherings in India, more especially to that crowded and influential town's meeting convened by the Sheriff of Bombay, which is fully reported in the weekly summaries from that city, dated February 1st.

Coming to the more special aspect of this fevered episode in recent Indian affairs; one would like to impress on our too easy-going politicians that not only has the anger and scorn aroused been general, but that those feelings have been most emphatically expressed by the European portion of the Indian population. Here, at once, is a test and a portent. It is inevitable, to some extent, that Anglo-Indians and the people of the country should incline to regard public affairs from different standpoints; while the, often erroneously assumed, rivalry in class or personal interests sometimes prevents the two races from acting in concert regarding public questions. Thus, tried by the test of unanimity, wonderful from its rarity, the co-operation of Anglo-Indians in denouncing the recent transaction between Lancashire and the Secretary of State cuts short any argument or apologies. This mandate stands finally condemned, without opening for appeal—only steady, persistent demand for repeal. As to "portent," perhaps admonition would be the better term, for it will apply to both parties—non-official Anglo-Indians and their bureaucratic rulers. The suggestion naturally arises, seeing that Europeans and Indians have in this instance found themselves in the same boat (though, as Jerrold remarked, with different sculls) in vindicating public interests and equitable principles, why should not the former be more ready than hitherto in associating their public efforts with the people of "the land they live in," when fiscal, financial, and public works questions arise in respect of which neither racial nor political differences exist, and in regard to which the interests of all classes and races dwelling in the great peninsula are equally concerned? Here, in passing, I may recall the name of George Yule, as one, amongst a few others of the dominant race, who have heartily co-operated with the intelligent and public-spirited portion of the sons of the soil. It is possible that some such fruitful union for public purposes may be one of the by-products left from the high tide of this cotton-duty crisis. If so, some of the placemen who make a mockery of "legislation's sovereign powers," by thrusting the "mandate" in the face of their non-official colleagues, will find the task more difficult when they again essay to defy that genuine public opinion which has presented itself in united form during the recent crisis.

This brings me to the second noticeable point in the attitude and temper of Anglo-Indians during this vigorous agitation. The one incident of all

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

others that impressed them in the course taken by the Indian Government in forcing the Bill (now an Act) through the Legislative Council, was that it was directly due to "orders from home," that the Viceroy and his colleagues obsequiously accepted the "mandate" of the Secretary of State in London. They could go far in excusing the official members for thus voting to order; but when it was claimed by the Executive that the "additional," that is, the non-official members, partly nominated and partly elected, were also under compulsion to vote as the Secretary of State had bidden them, every political instinct of the true Briton rose up against this emasculation of the representative principle. It is true that the claim had been affirmed on the former occasion, in December, 1894, when the exemption of cotton was to cease and import duties to be offset by the Excise. Lord Elgin partly set himself to justify the doctrine of "mandate," applying it, as against Sir Griffith Evans (a nominated barrister member), so as to include all members of the Legislature. His lordship, indeed, avoided in that instance attributing the compulsory authority to the Secretary of State. He said, "Every man who sits here sits by the authority and sanction of Parliament, and to say that he can refuse to obey the decisions of Parliament would be absurd." This, however, was only, and for the immediate purpose, to avoid disclosing the real objective—the Secretary of State. Sir James Westland, on the same occasion, carried the argument a step further in a passage of some ingenuity (which need not be quoted here). He hinted that the power over *all* the members lay with "the ultimate deciding power in Executive matters."[1]

To this complexion, in its naked form, the issue has been brought in the recent controversy. Hence, as I have said, with all of British race, in addition to many Indians, has been raised a strong protest against what they regard as violation of the independence and responsibility of legislators, even under the hybrid form which obtains in the Indian Legislative Councils. The Anglo-Indian press expressed that resentment in vigorous fashion, to an extent and in terms which our press here only uses under circumstances of extreme provocation. If a list of these journalistic protests could be compiled it would astonish not only the Executive authorities here, but also that limp creature "the average member." But it would also demonstrate that "the last straw" was the "mandate" which broke down that patience in political matters which generally obtains amongst mercantile and other Europeans in India. The *Times of India* said, "This is the system of 'mandate' with a vengeance;" "if Lord George Hamilton had desired to exasperate public opinion in this country, to convince it that the Viceroy's Government is powerless to protect its interests . . . . and that the Legislative Council is a helpless automaton;" "they (the Viceroy and the Executive) appear to have their orders and they know of no other way of dealing with orders from the India Office than giving to them an unquestioning obedience"; "obstruction . . . . is a process which cannot be carried far in India, and no one would willingly see it introduced in a Legislative Council . . . . (but,) when the cause makes so imperative a claim as it does in this instance, it might be resorted to with no misgivings"; "the Home Government are determined that Indian finances and legislation shall be regulated in callous disregard for the interests of the people of the land"; "having had such convincing proofs that they must not look for protection to the Secretary of State or to a Legislature over which his control threatens to be absolute, they should now look in other directions"—and so on. It must be admitted that these, and scores of similar passages that might be cited, are strong enough even for an "independent" Irish press; but they express the sentiments of the ruling race in India in this instance. From such language even those of our public men who are usually indifferent to the affairs of that dependency may learn how deep is the wound inflicted on the Indian community, as a whole, by thus subordinating its equitable claims to class interests in England under the pressure of political and party expediency.

But, after all, regarding the doctrine of "mandate" as a whole, there is a broader view of the subject which has been usefully brought to notice by an Anglo-Guzerati journal, the *Kaiser-i-Hind*, of Bombay. After remarking "it is manifest that the Government of India has made a grave political blunder of the first magnitude by its latest attempt in the direction of legislation by mandate," the writer proceeds:—

> "The 'mandate' theory is a most dangerous theory. In our opinion it is a double-edged instrument of torture and oppression. It will cut India both ways. If you cry aloud in the future, pointing out the present striking instance of what an arbitrary Secretary of State dare do, and agitate that in future the Government of India should never heed the mandates of the Maháráját for the time being ensconced on the Imperial *Gadee* at Westminster, you do not exercise that political sagacity and foresight which are so much needed for keeping the Indian administration, secret and irresponsible as it is, on its good behaviour. For it should be well remembered that to one mandate of the character against which we are presently inveighing, and inveighing with justice, there are nine others in which the Secretary of State is more in the right and endeavours to act more as an earthly Providence between the despotic Government of India on the one hand and the helpless and unrepresented people of the country on the other. This is an *historical* fact, and can be verified. It will be evident, therefore, that on the whole the 'mandates' of the State Secretary have generally worked in and on behalf of the interests of the people as against the beneficed bureaucracy and their friends who belong to the governing classes, who, therefore, are justly denominated the unbeneficed bureaucracy."

It is not needful to criticise this passage; though it would be serviceable if we could have a *precis* of the "historical facts" going to show that in nine cases out of ten the "mandate" of the Secretary of State has been on behalf of "the helpless and unrepresented people." That may have been so if we go far enough back—these instances relate more to executive orders than to legislative policy—but one finds that within the last dozen years or so the

[1] Those who wish to study the subject on its juridical side in the light of the history of the Indian Legislative Councils, may be referred to two papers in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* (April, 1895, No. 18), one by Mr. Justice C. D. Field, the other by Mr. J. W. Neil, I.C.S., formerly Judicial Commissioner of the Central Provinces.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

balance has been the other way. The broader aspect of the question is fitly described thus :—

"We therefore, repeat, and raise our warning voice, that our countrymen should not be carried away by the temporary excitement of the hour in entirely condemning the mandate theory. A calm and careful consideration of the *pros* and *cons* will at once lead to the conviction that though the mandate theory sometimes works against their best interests, as in the present case, on the whole it is calculated to do more good than harm to our cause."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Laurence Hugh Jenkins, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, to be a Judge of the High Court of Calcutta, in the room of Mr. Justice Pigot, who has retired.

Mr. Jenkins, who succeeds Mr. Jones Quain Pigot, is the son of a solicitor at Cardigan. He was born in 1858, is a graduate of University College, Oxford, and has been at the Bar for the past thirteen years.

The *Law Journal* contradicts the report that Mr. Bompas, Q.C., has been offered the Chief Justiceship of the High Court of Calcutta. It is suggested that some time must elapse before any appointment is made, as Sir William Comer Petheram will not retire until September.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Francis Charles Le Marchant as a member of the Council of India, in succession to Mr. Bertram Currie, whose tenure of the office expired in December last.

Sir W. Wedderburn has followed up his questions on the subject of the evictions and sales for the recovery of land revenue in the Madras Presidency with a request for a comprehensive Return which will show the accurate figures under the most important heads. The Return is to give, for each of the years 1883-4 to 1893-4 inclusive, the total cultivated area in acres, the total waste acres, the total notices of sale, the total defaulters whose property was sold, details of the property sold (showing the estimated value in rupees of the real and the personal property respectively), the amount realised by actual sale, and the total number of acres sold (*a*) to Government and (*b*) to others. The figures stated in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions were taken from the official reports of the Revenue Board, but owing, we understand, to a printer's error, two trivial inaccuracies crept in which had the effect of under-stating the facts. Lord George Hamilton, whose answer is dealt with elsewhere, made a rather questionable use of this slip. His own Return will now place the grave facts fully before the public on the explicit authority of the India Office.

Sir Seymour King M.P., has given notice that on an early day he will move for an address for copy of despatch, with enclosures from the Government of India, No. 15, Public Works, dated 28th January, 1890, regarding the rate of exchange for the pensions of certain Government servants in India ; and for an address for copy of report of the Committee which sat at Simla in 1894 under the Presidency of Mr. R. D. Lyall, I.C.S., to investigate the best means for reducing the establishment charges and expenses in the Military Works and Public Works Departments

On March 17th Sir John Lubbock—the author of a volume upon the pleasures of life—presented to the House of Commons an amusing petition purporting to come from the Kammalars of Southern India. Somehow or other a verbose paragraph was circulated among the newspapers setting forth the objects of the petition. But its history is more aptly stated by the *Madras Standard*, whose account, as Sir John Lubbock may not yet have read it, we reproduce here :

The South India Visvakulotharana Association (is it a joke?) recently submitted two bound volumes, containing respectively, a petition in original, and a printed copy thereof, "exposing the intentions and aims of the so-called Indian National Congress," with the request that they may be submitted to Parliament. The Madras Government forwarded the precious indictment to the Government of India—at whose expense, we are not told—and informed the petitioners that the Government washed their hands of any further responsibility in the matter. But they desired the Government of India to let them know whether they were in future to send petitions to Parliament other than appeals against the orders of the Secretary of State. The Government of India have informed the local Government that all petitions to the Houses of Parliament should be presented unofficially and not be transmitted through the Government of India or the Secretary of State. The petitioners were to be informed that they must present their petition through the medium of some unofficial member of the House. But the Kammalars (goldsmiths) of South India neglecting their peaceful avocation to indulge in the warlike demonstration against the "so-called Indian National Congress"—that is the contemptuous manner in which the Madras Government and the Government of India speak of the Congress—is so prodigious a joke that we can only regret so much fuss should have been made of it.

Mr. A. Nundy, who during the past few months has been an active member of the British Committee, left London on March 30th for Naples, *en route* for Calcutta. A few days before he left he read a paper, on the Union of Indian Christians, at the first public meeting of the Indian Christian Association of Great Britain, held at the Y.M.C.A., Aldersgate Street, E.C., under the presidency of Mr. W. S. Caine. Mr. Nundy said that it had been the desire of Christians in India for some time to form a Christian Union among themselves, and he deplored the wrangling that arose from sectarian prejudices largely infused into new converts by the various missionary denominations. The time had come for Indian Christians to organise a union among themselves, and to drop all denominational distinction. Dr. Jenkins, Mr. Percy Bunting, and others also spoke.

The Directors' Report on the Empire of India Exhibition of 1895, already dealt with in the press, does justice to the valuable co-operation rendered by the "Society for Encouragement and Preservation of Indian Art," which, alike through the work of the Indian artisans and the contributions of Indian Princes and Chiefs to the Loan Collection, greatly enhanced the interest of the Exhibition. The S.E.P.I.A. intends, we understand, to follow up the encouraging protection it has already afforded to the decorative handicraft art-work of India with a collection of its own, which is to be shown at the Albert Hall during a few weeks in May and June next. This will be somewhat on the same plan as that adopted by the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"Home Arts and Industries Association" in the same building. For us the interest attaching to this renewed effort of the S.E.P.I.A. consists in the direct communication that has been fairly initiated with the Indian artisans themselves. Efforts are being made—in which many Indians will, we trust, be induced to co-operate—in extending and applying on the spot that direct personal encouragement to the too long neglected art-workers in all provinces of India which the Society has done so much to initiate, and with great success. It has proved that there is active and appreciative demand here for Indian art-work, in metals, woods, ivory, and textiles of all sorts, where the genuineness in material and design can be assured.

By the death of Lady Burton the world has lost one of the most powerful and romantic female figures of modern times. She cannot be considered apart from her husband, nor did she ever wish to be. The history of her life is the history of her love for Sir Richard Burton, that "modern Paladin" and "Crichton of the day," as she once described him in a girlish letter to her mother. When she first saw Captain Burton at Boulogne, she turned round to her sister and said, "That man will marry me." She tells us that when he proposed to her she felt "as if the moon had tumbled down and said, 'I thought you cried for me, and so I came.'" Forty years later she "consecrated" her husband's biography, "To my Earthly Master. Meet me soon—I wait the signal." There is something Oriental and foreign to Western sentiment in the utter self-effacement of this wifely devotion. Yet here, too, she displays her spiritual kinship with her husband, in whose nature the eternal contradiction of East and West seems to have been all but completely solved.

It is amusing to compare some of Mr. Lecky's latest utterances with his earlier. For instance, in his new work on "Democracy and Liberty" there is an important passage in defence of university representation in general, and of the representation of Dublin University in particular. But here is a passage from his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century":

> No other constituencies represent so exclusively the highly educated classes as the Universities, and the political influence of the Universities has been almost uniformly hostile to political progress. It is very necessary that opinions which have been formed in the drawing-room or the study should be brought in contact with that shrewd middle-class intellect which judges questions on broader issues, and sometimes with larger sympathies. There are, it is true, great sections of the community who are quite incapable of forming any reasonable or competent judgment on political question; but they, too, have their interests, which may be injured, and it is right that their sufferings and their real or fancied grievances should find a voice in the Legislature. In politics the evils that spring from monopoly are sometimes even graver than the evils which spring from incompetence. ("History of England in the Eighteenth Century," III., pp, 215-216.)

But after all, (as the *Daily News* says) why should not philosophers change their minds, as well as the rest of the world? As one of the most distinguished of their number asked, why should all the most valuable privileges be reserved for fools?

The death of Judge Hughes, at the ripe age of seventy-three, removes from English life one of its most striking figures. The author of the most successful boy's book ever written, and the last survivor of the group of "Christian Socialists" which included men like Maurice and Kingsley, was not an ordinary person. "Tom" Hughes was the muscular Christian to perfection, and (says the *Manchester Guardian*) we do not use the terms with any suggestion of disparagement or irony. They do not, it is true, imply the subtlest intellect or the austerest spirituality. Judge Hughes was neither a philosopher nor a saint, but he was "a broad-shouldered genial Englishman," with a natural preference, thoroughly well cultivated, for everything that was brave and honest and manly, and with a large affectionate heart.

His political opinions were those of the *Spectator*, a little old-fashioned, therefore, and much less democratic than he imagined, and only "Liberal" by courtesy. The great schoolmaster from whom he learned so much was a Liberal and a democrat in a far deeper and truer sense than his pupil. But even in politics Judge Hughes rendered services by his attitude throughout the American civil war, and he was one of the Englishmen most liked and trusted in the United States. It may seem an easy thing to write a story of school life, but the facts show that to do so without being either twaddling or sentimental is extremely difficult, and "Tom Brown's School Days" remains to this day without an equal and almost without a rival. That book has helped to mould the characters of many generations of English boys, and it has taught them nothing but what was honest and good. The writer of it is sure of a place in the memory and affection of his countrymen.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

SIR J. WESTLAND'S STATEMENT FOR 1896-97.

On March 18th the Secretary of State for India received the following telegram from the Viceroy:—

"Sir J. Westland will to-day present the financial statement for 1896-97 in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General. The statement begins by announcing the restoration of the famine insurance grant, with effect from the date of its suspension. The amount will, however, for the present be taken at Rx. 1,000,000 instead of Rx. 1,500,000, this amount being considered, on a review of 15 years' transactions, to make sufficient provision for present needs.

"The accounts for 1894-95 closed Rx. 259,000 better than the revised estimate of the year, but as the famine insurance grant involves an additional charge of Rx. 557,000, the result on the whole is a surplus of Rx. 693,000, against Rx. 991,000 estimated last March. The result in the revised estimate for 1895-96 is that, after paying the charges of the Chitral expedition—Rx. 1,750,000, besides £16,000 sterling in England—and restoring the famine insurance grant to the extent mentioned and repaying the provincial contribution, aggregating Rx. 405,000, levied in 1894-95, there is a surplus of Rx. 951,000. Of this improvement in the financial position Rx. 1,436,000 is ascribed to smaller charges for ex-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

change, as 13 68d. has been realized, against 13·09d. originally estimated, and English expenditure was £249,000 less than the estimate. Rx. 197,000 arises from better opium revenue and Rx. 676,000 from short payments under the same head, the crop having again been short. There is an improvement of Rx.243,000 under other principal revenue heads and Rx.462,000 savings under ordinary military expenditure, prices during this year having been favourable.

"The Government base their Budget estimate for 1896-97 on a 1s. 1¾d. rate of exchange, being desirous of avoiding all speculation as to maintenance of better rates established during the last two months. At this rate the estimate shows a surplus of Rx.463,000. Compared with last year's estimates, there is a falling off in land revenue of Rx.276,000, due to unfavourable agricultural prospects, and in Customs of Rx. 333,000, due to reduction of scale of cotton duties. Railways also will produce slightly less net earnings, but other revenue heads show considerable improvement, and the expenditure shows little increase. A special grant of Rx.495,000 is made for army mobilization, chiefly purchase of animals and material for transport and 1,000 reserve artillery horses. A large programme of railway capital expenditure is laid down—viz., Rx.7,270,000 on State lines, including East Indian Railway and Bengal-Assam Railway, besides Rx. 1,150,000 advance to Bengal-Nagpur Railway and Indian Midland Railway for their extensions. These figures do not include other companies' construction.

"It is announced, with the usual reserve, that the Secretary of State for India proposes to draw for £16,500,000, and that a rupee loan of four crores will be raised in India."

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed on March 19th:—

"Sir J. Westland in his Budget speech deals at length with the famine insurance grant. He shows that, although the Government have occasionally had to give up the self-imposed obligation of providing one-and-a-half crores annually, yet in 15 years they have set aside 17 crores 64 lakhs of revenue for purposes of famine relief and insurance, almost entirely the latter, and have further realised a surplus of over seven crores. Only 31 lakhs have been actually spent on famine relief, while 18 crores and 65½ crores have been spent upon protective, irrigation, and railway works respectively. Further, upon the guarantee of the insurance grant, capital has been raised for the construction of the Indian Midland and Bengal-Nagpur railways.

"Sir J. Westland remarks:—

"'We have, moreover, charged off against the revenue account and set aside 532 lakhs in the form of a reduction or avoidance of debt—that is, we possess this sum as a sort of accumulated surplus of revenue over and above the forward total of our ordinary surpluses. I need not say that this is a far better position than what was considered in any way probable when the famine insurance policy was initiated, for the anticipation then was that we should actually spend about 15 crores upon famine relief in ten years and not have any part of it in hand in the shape either of completed works or of money unspent. The improvement is due, for the most part, to the fact that we have during these 15 years, been much more free from famines than we in any way anticipated. To what extent famines may be awaiting us in the future it would be rash to speculate. One thing we do know is that our financial and our protective preparation for them is infinitely superior to what it was at the time when the insurance policy was laid down. While regarding famine insurance as an essential portion of their financial policy the Government consider themselves fully justified in measuring it by a lower standard than in 1880. It has therefore been determined to aim at establishing a standard of reserve sufficient to provide only one crore annually.'

"With regard to the rate of exchange for the ensuing year, Sir J. Westland shows how the value of the rupee gradually rose during the past twelve months from 13 1⅝d. to 14¾d. He remarks:—

"'The prospects indicated by these figures are decidedly encouraging, but as last year the Government made up their mind to avoid any speculations as to the future, so this year, also, they have determined in their estimates to take no account of the recent, and perhaps yet unexhausted, rise in exchange. They consider it very important in the present circumstances to be on the safe side, and have fixed the exchange to be taken in the Budget estimates at a rate which would certainly have been deemed wise and prudent in the beginning of February, though to many persons it may appear, in the light of more recent events, to err on the safe side. The rate taken is 13¾d., being only slightly in advance of the realised rate of the current year. If we could calculate on a rate approaching the present current rate the time would have come for a revision of our general financial position, but we believe that no one will consider our position sufficiently assured for any such measures.'

"With regard to military expenditure, the Budget estimate is 24 crores 29 lakhs, of which nearly 50 lakhs are for preparations for mobilisation. The latter will involve a recurring charge next year of six lakhs, and thereafter of about 13 lakhs annually. It is remarked that military expenditure in India continues to increase and sterling expenditure to decrease. The re-arming of the troops and batteries with new rifles and guns has caused heavy expenditure on military stores, which began in 1887, and sterling expenditure increased from that year onwards to 1893, when it reached the *maximum*. Since then it has declined, the re-armament having been completed. The estimate for special defence works for the ensuing year is only 57⅔ lakhs, which practically completes the expenditure under this head. Five crores were originally sanctioned for defences, but but only 46¾ lakhs will be spent, as it has been decided not to proceed with certain inland defences. But for the mobilisation grant, the army expenditure will be less than it was last year.

"The Budget shows how great will be the activity in railway construction during the ensuing year. The capital expenditure by the State and companies will exceed 11¼ crores, while 75 lakhs will be spent on irrigation works. Sixty-two lakhs are allotted for the Mandalay-Kunlong railway.

"With regard to the threatened famine, it is remarked that the failure of the cold weather rains in the north of India, in addition to reducing land revenue and increasing irrigation revenue, has also compelled the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh to provide a sum of seven lakhs for famine relief. The Bengal Government has also repeated next year the provision of half a lakh for famine relief by local bodies which was made in the estimate of this year, but will not be required. This does not, however, indicate any expectation of scarcity in Bengal. No other Government has thought it necessary to make any provision for

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

famine relief, but in some places, particularly in the North-West Provinces and the native States of Rajputana and Central India, the commencement of the railway works in contemplation is being hastened on with the object of providing work in districts which are threatened with scarcity.

"Sir John Westland, in conclusion, says:

"'Last year my final estimate of the position was that, though we were as yet far from a complete restoration of our fortunes, we might claim to have made a fair amount of progress towards their restoration. Our prospects are now very much more hopeful. Our revenues are advancing, our expenditure is well in hand; but, above all, the rate of exchange shows a tendency to establish itself at a figure which, if maintained, will remove our most serious anxieties. I refrain from any prophecies as to the future, but it is pleasant to know that the direction in which our financial position is changing, which always contains many elements over which we have practically no control, will have to suffer a considerable reverse before we are again in the difficulties which we had to face two years ago.'"

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

PETITIONS TO PARLIAMENT.

The following list of petitions praying that competitive examinations for the Civil Service of India may be held simultaneously in England and in India are taken from the Report of the Select Committee on Public Petitions:—

1895.

Aug. 19.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Bammanhalli-Hanagal-Dharwar, Taluka District, Bombay Presidency (Sir Charles Dalrymple) ..	315
Aug. 23.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Taluka Karajgy (Sir William Wedderburn)	
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Puntamba (Sir W. Wedderburn)	
Aug. 27.	There undersigned inhabitants of Cocanada (Sir W. Wedderburn)	98
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Cocanada (Sir W. Wedderburn)	101
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Hospet (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	91
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Jaganadhapuram (Sir William Wedderburn)	100
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	101
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	107
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madura (Sir W. Wedderburn) ..	107
	Total number of petitions 10—Signatures	1,020

1896.

Feb. 13.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Sholapur (Sir W. Wedderburn)	290
,,	There-undersignsd inhabitants of Virapandi (Sir W. Wedderburn)	207
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Gorakhpur (Sir W. Wedderburn)	301
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Madras (Sir W. Wedderburn)	196
Feb. 13.	There-undersigned inhabitants of Pudukota (Sir W. Wedderburn)	407
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Ramanasanmithurum (Sir William Wedderburn)	810
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Rayapuram (Sir W. Wedderburn)	542
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Kuttalam (Sir W. Wedderburn)	111
,,	There-undersigned inhabitants of Vayalpad (Sir W. Wedderburn)	142
	Total number of Petitions 9—Signatures	3,096

Taking together the returns for August, 1895, and February last, we find that 19 petitions have been presented, containing 4,116 signatures.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE POONA CONGRESS.

In our February number we published, from such information as was then available, the text of the Resolutions passed at the Eleventh Indian National Congress at Poona. Having now received the authorised text, we notify the following *errata*:—

Resolution V., line 5, for "from" read "by"; line 7, after "Council" insert "on the subject."
Resolution VI., line 7, for "most respectfully" read "again"; line 8, for "entreats" read "urges."
Resolution VII., line 4, for "natives" read "people."
Resolution X., line 3, for "public Legislation" read "Legislature."
Resolution XII., line 8, after "Congress" insert "once again"; line 11, for "another" read "the other."
Resolution XVII., at end of line 2, insert "third class"; line 3, after "passages" insert "from whom the largest portion of railway revenue is derived"; line 5, for "their redress" read "an early redress of their grievances."
Resolution XVIII., line 11, for "forest" read "forests."
Resolution XX., at end of line 4, insert "or that fees in educational institutions wholly or partially supported by the State should be increased."
Resolution XXI, line 3, after "twenties" insert "from Excise duty."
Resolution XXII., omit clause (j) including sections (i) and (ii).
Resolution XXIII., line 3, after "INDIA" insert "and also for the expense of the Joint General Secretary's office."
Resolution XXV., line 2, after "Secretary" insert "and appoints Mr. D. E. Wacha to be its Joint General Secretary."

Reviews.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

Charles Bradlaugh: a Record of his Life and Work. By his daughter, HYPATIA BRADLAUGH BONNER. With an account of his Parliamentary Struggle, Politics, and Teachings, by JOHN M. ROBERTSON. In 2 vols. Second edition. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Though this remarkable biography is now in a second edition, there needs no apology for recalling attention to it. So distinctive was the position taken up by Mr. Bradlaugh in the life and politics of his time, that it is especially satisfactory to have

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a permanent record of the real facts of his career on unimpeachable authority. It was quite inevitable that he should be largely misunderstood and frequently misrepresented, honestly as well as dishonestly. Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner, with immense labour and unwearied patience, supported by filial affection and admiration, has cleared away a vast number of injurious fictions concerning the life and action of her distinguished father; and Mr. John M. Robertson has set forth in the clearest manner the meaning and purpose of Mr. Bradlaugh's political, social, and religious teachings, and the history of his parliamentary struggle. Between them, they have drawn as accurate a portrait of the man as can be hoped for—a portrait whose lines will certainly stand out more marked and pleasing as time lays the dust of prejudiced controversies and clears away the haze of unreason and intolerance.

We do not propose to follow in detail the events of Mr. Bradlaugh's career—his family circumstances; his juvenile collision with senseless and unsympathetic professors of religion; his early struggles as office-boy, wharf clerk and cashier, "coal merchant" and soldier; his laborious lecturings and debatings on a thousand platforms, on religious, social, and political questions; his sufferings in person, reputation, and estate, from his uncompromising maintenance of unpopular opinions that he thoroughly believed to be right. These things have been generally set forth already, and any one who really cares for them will turn with interest to the full and true record preserved by Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner. They represent a most varied, strenuous, and sincere spirit struggling all but hopelessly against the adamantine barriers of petrified prejudices, social narrowness, political obfuscation, and religious fanaticism, under the burden of inadequate material means. Mr. Bradlaugh may, not unfrequently, have been in the wrong on the merits; he may have been still more frequently in the wrong in point of procedure. He was not much of a strategist; he always delivered his attack right on the enemy's front. No doubt the plan has its advantages in the long run, but the run is a very long one, and it seldom pays the individual in his own life-time. There is no cause for wonder that Mr. Bradlaugh died before his time, worn out in the complicated and harassing struggle, strong man though he was. The forces of a traditional society are too powerful to be shocked by the direct assault of any one man. Sir Hugh Rose did not dash himself against the western face of the stronghold of Jhansi, or against the sandstone precipices of the fortress of Gwalior. Still, Bradlaugh's methods testify to his personal convictions and sincerity of action, and invest his career with the quality of heroic single-mindedness. This feeling is deeply accentuated by his constant involvement in the trammels of poverty. The straightforward narrative of his daughter happily disposes for ever of the injurious aspersions of thoughtless or venomous opponents on his motives and actions; and, in particular, Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner finally places in their true light, at painful cost to her personal feelings, the real relations between Bradlaugh and his wife, and Bradlaugh and his brother, William Robert Bradlaugh. His outer face, ironclad to the hostile world, contrasts dramatically with his inner face, bright and soft to his relatives and friends. Taken all in all, Bradlaugh was a strong and sincere man, often wrong-headed, oftener still in the right, but always having the courage of his opinions; and, if he too frequently made his own path difficult, he has in many ways rendered the road more easy for the progress of his successors in most of his various lines of activity.

Mr. Robertson has done his share of the work of this memorial of Bradlaugh in very thorough fashion, notwithstanding considerable discursiveness. Like the purely biographical part, this critical and explanatory part ought to be carefully read and considered. We cannot tackle even all the main points, but must content ourselves with the extraction of a few illustrative examples of Mr. Robertson's positions. Thus:

"Bradlaugh was not the untrained Atheist of the Theistic imagination, who may be confounded with a quotation from Kant by one of the personages of Mrs. Ward's religious vaudevilles. . . . . Beginning as a boy to defend his Theism in debate, he saw it demolished by one of those born debaters who are found every now and then among the working class. . . . . But he did not trust to "mother-wit," his own or another's. He read all the philosophic literature he could lay hands on; in particular he became a close student of Spinoza. A clergyman of my acquaintance maintains that to the end he was a Spinozist. It would be less misleading to say that he employed much of the method of Spinoza to establish the Atheism to which Spinoza's doctrine practically leads, while always scrupulously recognising that Spinoza formulated Pantheism and professed only to modify the God-idea. . . . . All the psychological line of argument, as put by Kant and his adaptors, is fully and patiently met by Bradlaugh in his section of the "Freethinker's Text-Book," which deals in turn with all the main pleas of orthodoxy."

Mr. Robertson claims that "while Bradlaugh was an exact thinker and reasoner, he distinguished himself above all the rationalists of his time by the energy and persistence with which he sought to bring his philosophy home to the popular mind." "For him, creed was action, and action creed."

"That a doctrine is false was to him a reason for exposing it as such; and, though as a utilitarian he held that truth is the best policy, he did not wait for the demonstration before choosing his course. He had, in fact, that love of truth for its own sake which is the inspiration of all scientific progress; but he had it without restriction, or at least with as little restriction as can well be. . . . He would give facilities for all conscientious truth-seeking whatever, barring only random disclosures of sensational facts with no better motive than

Insect Bites or Stings, Chafed Skin, Piles, Cuts, Sore Eyes, Sunburn, Earache, Neuralgic and Rheumatic Pains, Throat Colds, and Skin Ailments, Quickly Relieved by use of

CALVERT'S CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp, and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT and CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

sensation, or with no likelihood of edification to balance the likelihood of the reverse. As to the great themes of belief and discussion in all ages, he simply could not think that human welfare is promoted by maintaining beliefs known to be false. He was a democrat in religion as well as in politics."

"The practice of boycotting for opinion's sake he detested and denounced, and never in any way resorted to."

"He even carried the spirit of "tolerance" to an extreme degree in his own affairs, being careful, as his daughter testifies, to avoid giving his children anything like specific anti-theological teaching, on the ground that the opinions of the young ought not to be stereotyped for them on points which they ought to reconsider for themselves when they grow up. In intercourse with those about him he was equally scrupulous; and all the contributors to his journal can tell how complete was the freedom he gave them to express in its pages opinions from which he dissented. In this he was far superior to many who have aspersed him as overbearing. It was a point of honour with him to give a hearing in his columns to all manner of opposition to his own views; and no man was ever less apt to let his philosophical convictions bias him in his practical or political relations with people of another way of thinking."

Bradlaugh's political doctrine may be broadly described "as a demand for the fullest admission of the people to the rights of self-government, and, further, the application of the powers thus acquired to the removal or reform of all laws framed in the interest of the upper few. This was the ideal he had formed for himself in his youth, and he declined to substitute for it the ideal of Socialism, which had begun to be vaguely popular towards the end of his life. The refusal rested on his experience, and on his character." We pass by the other points in his political career to notice what Mr. Robertson says about Bradlaugh's interest in India.

"In virtue of the qualities which made him a warm friend of Ireland, Bradlaugh was all his life, and in latter years still more warmly, the friend of India. All his instincts of justice and sympathy were moved by the spectacle of that vast congeries of immemorially immature races, ruled by a bureaucracy of Englishmen, none of whom would for a moment be trusted to exercise similar power over their fellow-countrymen, but all of whom collectively are assumed by their countrymen to need next to no supervision when ruling a "lower" race. Again and again Bradlaugh protested, as other Englishmen had protested before him, against the inveterate apathy with which the House of Commons regards Indian questions. . . . .

"Bradlaugh was under no delusions as to the present political capacity of the Indian races. He perfectly recognised their bias to rhetoric and their immaturity of character, as well as the enormous difficulties in the way of their political amalgamation. Hence his program for them was an extremely gradual introduction of the principle of self-rule. . . . . The Home Rule principle, which was for Bradlaugh a principle of universal virtue, however different the degree of its application to a given case at a given moment, must in time be wrought out in India as elsewhere, if only it goes forward in the West, and the West keeps up its growing intercourse with the East. And it was one of his many political merits to have been one of the first to see this not only abstractly but in the concrete.',

Mr. Robertson goes at great length into the history of the deplorable Parliamentary struggle. That we must leave on one side. Take this glimpse of Bradlaugh on the platform:

"As a lecturer, of course, he was vigorous to the highest degree. Many of those who have heard him at the height of his powers will agree to the verdict that he was by far the most powerful English orator of his time. There was something overwhelming in his force of speech when impassioned; it lifted an audience from its feet like a storm, and raised their intellectual conviction to a white heat of enthusiasm for the truth it conveyed. Other speakers of his day may have been as thrillingly impressive at their best moments; but he had great passages in nearly every speech, and rarely faced an audience without electrifying it."

"Of his influence on his followers those can best speak who have mixed with them."

"Personal and magnetic as it was, it depended for its continuance on the unvarying nobility of his appeal to the best instincts—to courage, honour, justice, and the love of truth. Hundreds of men—men to whom the generality of pulpit sermons are either inane commonplaces or maudlin nonsense—can testify to the fashion in which he stirred them to high sympathies and generous determinations, making life for all of them, however narrow their sphere, a vista of worthy activities and abiding consolations."

These extracts are little more than chance indications of some of the characteristics of these exhaustive volumes, but we hope they may suffice to show that the work constitutes a most interesting memorial of one of the most distinctive careers of the century. It presents Mr. Bradlaugh in manner as he lived; and no fair-minded reader can rise from its perusal without a deepened respect for its distinguished subject. Both the authors, in their different ways, have thrown a much-needed light upon the life and ways of thought of a man that suffered more than any other public man of his time from gross misrepresentation in every possible respect. The voice of calumny is not readily stilled; but these volumes ought to do much towards a juster criticism of Bradlaugh at the hands of all honest men, however much they may disagree with his principles or his practice. They will be much prized by those who knew his private worth and personal sincerity, whether or not seeing eye to eye with him on all points of opinion and belief.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1896.

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). "Medical Aid for Indian Women." Rogers, Alexander, "Indian Peasant Settlements." Chatterjee, B. C. (the late), "The Globe of Gold."

NEW REVIEW. "The Revision of the Indian Tariff."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1896.

MACLEAN, JAMES MACKENZIE	"A Guide to Bombay: Historical, Statistical, and Descriptive." (Street and Co.)	
SHIEL, M. P.	"The Rájá's Sapphire." (Ward, Lock)	2s. 6d
MAKAY, J. C., F.G.S.	"Light Railways for the United Kingdom, India, and the Colonies." (Crosby, Lockwood)	15s. 0d.
BOSE, PRAMATHA NATH, B.Sc., F.G.S.	"A History of Hindu Civilization during British Rule." Vol. III—Intellectual Condition. (Kegan Paul)	7s. 6d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 5. (NEW SERIES.) MAY, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	129
The Indian Budget, by Professor A. F. Murison, L.L.D.	134
Venereal Diseases in the European Army in India, by Professor Stuart, M.P.	135
The Duty of the Liberal Party towards India, by A. G. Symonds, M.A.	136
Land Revenue Assessment in Madras, by Alexander Rogers	137
The British Empire League, by J. Dacosta	139
The Indian Budget: What Indian Critics think	141
Reactionary Enterprises—and after	145
Political Science	147
Intellectual India	148
Our London Letter	150
Indian Military Expenditure, by D. E. Wacha	151
The Cost of Solvency to India	154
The "Forward" Policy: A Blundering Agreement	155
Reviews: Sketches by Pai	157
Self-Criticism	158
About the Burman	160
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	160
Recent Official Publications	160

Indiana.

The Indian Budget.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found an article by Professor A. F. Murison upon the Indian Budget, and a series of extracts from speeches and articles by Indian critics upon the expenditure of the revenues which they raise, but are not in any degree permitted to control. Public speakers and writers in the United Kingdom have, during the past fortnight, called attention to the "hundred million Budget" which the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently explained in the House of Commons, and which will be fully discussed by the elected representatives of the tax-payers before it is sanctioned. The Indian Budget (if, for the sake of comparison, Rs. 10 may be regarded as equivalent to £1 sterling) deals with more than a hundred millions, and every rupee that it disposes of involves a far greater sacrifice on the part of the Indian taxpayer than the sacrifice of a florin by a taxpayer in the United Kingdom. Yet the Indian Budget was dismissed at a single sitting, without amendment and without a division. The Indian members of the Viceroy's Council did, indeed, raise their voices in protest. But their warnings and remonstrances were unheeded, and could have no adequate effect. The debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons will be hardly less perfunctory and unsatisfactory. It will come on during the closing days of the Session. The attendance will be meagre, and the discussion more or less academic. The House of Commons will not be asked to approve the expenditure proposed by Sir James Westland for the current year. It will merely give its assent to the proposition that the total expenditure and the total revenue of the Government of India from April, 1894, to March, 1895, are correctly shown in the closed accounts. Lord Welby's Commission, unless rumour be false, has been looking into the mechanism of Indian finance. Lord Welby and his colleagues will fail in their duty unless they recommend drastic reform of a system which could not have been more ingeniously contrived to stereotype irresponsible authority in the hands of bureaucratic officials, and to withhold from the House of Commons both adequate knowledge and effective control. The present system might be less pernicious if Finance Ministers in India showed more disposition to hear courteously the opinions of those who merely pay the taxes. Sir James Westland makes a bad system worse, and its consequences more dangerous, when he permits himself to brush aside non-official critics as the unfortunate victims of "delusions" and "hallucinations."

A Legacy of Permanent Expenditure.

There is no need to refer here to what is said on another page with regard to the Famine Insurance Fund, the occupation of Chitral, the pressure of taxation, the raid upon Provincial surpluses, the harsh landlordism of the Government, the "forward" frontier policy,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and the grievous burden of military expenditure. "The Financial Statement," said Sir James Westland, "is not the place in which to defend the policy of the [Chitral] expedition or the occupation which has followed it." The Finance Minister thus relieved himself of a task which he would manifestly have found intolerable. For the Budget provision for the Chitral expedition was merely Rx. 150,000, while, in the words of the Financial Statement,

"The Chitral expedition has cost us Rx.67,200 in the accounts of 1894-95, Rx. 1,647,500 in the revised estimate of 1895-96, and a further sum of Rx. 20,000 will come under payment in 1896-97, giving a total of Rx. 1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. It has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications, which has involved in 1895-96 an expenditure of Rx.102,200, and will involve in 1896-97 an expenditure of Rx. 231,700."

Sir J. Westland explains in a footnote that these figures are irrespective of the "political" expenditure. Now, Mr. Balfour last November, professing, amid the cheers of a Glasgow audience, to "sweep away the arguments which had been urged against the retention of Chitral," dealt with the financial question in these words:

"It was said, in the second place, that it would cause an augmentation of the Indian army. It was said, in the third place, that it would greatly add to the expense of Indian administration. . . . . Well, I will dispose of these arguments in almost as many sentences. . . . . Let me tell you, with regard to the second argument, which states that augmentation of the Indian army would be required, that not one single soldier need be added to the Indian army in order to retain Chitral, and that the expense of the operation is one which is absolutely insignificant."

Lord George Hamilton had spoken to the same effect in the House of Commons in September. He had stated, indeed, that the cost of retention would be merely £13,000, although, at the suggestion of the House, he afterwards multiplied this figure by 10. These roseate estimates contrast painfully with Sir James Westland's accounts, and the contrast shows once again how foolish it is, where schemes of trans-frontier aggression are concerned, to accept the forecasts of those who resolve upon the enterprise first and count the cost afterwards.

The Optimism of Sir J. Westland.

Sir James Westland's conclusions are a piece of optimism which the House of Commons will do well to correct by reference to Indian criticism. "Our revenues," he says, "are advancing, our expenditure is well in hand; but, above all, the rate of exchange shows a tendency to establish itself at a figure which, if maintained, will remove our most serious anxieties." "If maintained" is a curious foundation for the hopes of a prudent financier. Besides, the embarrassments of the Government of India have notoriously been due not to that convenient scapegoat, loss by exchange, but to the Government's persistent refusal to cut its coat according to its cloth. If the present rate of exchange be maintained it will, unless the Government of India mends its ways, only provide so much the more for the spendthrift to squander. "Our revenues are advancing"—but how? Paragragh 111 of the Financial Statement says that "we are usually able to count on an increase of land revenue from year to year." Exactly. The Government of India is a harsh landlord, and its severe enhancements of land revenue have given rise to widespread discontent. The last turn, it appears, has been given to the screw, and now "Burma is the only Province in which an appreciable increase is expected." "Our expenditure is well in hand"—but is it? Paragragh 123 sets forth the several departments in which the most important increases in expenditure have taken place. The least (Rx.61,400) is for Education. The largest (Rx.409,600) is for the army. The former sum, we are curtly informed, is merely "the usual increase of Provincial expenditure by the Governments which can afford it." To the latter must be added, among other items, Rx.68,800 for military works (where, again, the occupation of Chitral has caused an increase). There is food for thought also in Sir J. Westland's remark that "the provision of £30,000, made in 1895-96 for the visit to England of the son of the Amír of Afghanistan, is not required next year." And, of course, over and above the detailed provisions of a Budget, we have to remember those larger considerations, to which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has so patiently called attention, with reference to the unceasing drain of tribute from India to this country in the form of salaries, pensions, and the like. It is nearly twenty years since John Bright said at Manchester:

"I say that a Government put over two hundred and fifty millions of people, which has levied taxes till it can levy no more, which spends all that it can levy, and which has borrowed £100,000,000 more than all that it can levy—I say a Government like that has some fatal defect which, at some not distant time, must bring disaster and humiliation to the Government and to the people on whose behalf it rules."

How it strikes an Indian.

A Bombay correspondent writes with reference to the Indian Budget: "A series of windfalls, pure and simple, have like the good fairy come to the help of the embarrassed treasury, and the Finance Minister crows over his sudden good fortune which enables him, after making good the deficit on exchange in the accounts for 1894-95, and after restoring the Famine Fund to the extent of a crore, to show a surplus of 69 lakhs. For the ensuing year there is to be an estimated surplus of 46 lakhs, while the revised estimates for the year just closed show a surplus of 95 lakhs. These facts show how much uncertainty surrounds Indian finance. Of course, exchange is a disturbing factor. It contributes to the conversion

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of deficits into surpluses and *vice versa*. But it also proves that when there is something like a handsome surplus, the Government disposes of it in increased expenditure without remitting a pie of taxation. This year the Government has again made a new departure, on the plea that it is now unnecessary, after the experience of eighteen years, to set apart so large a sum as 1½ crores for the Famine Insurance Fund. Protective railways have been built during the interval, and irrigation works have been constructed. These have to a certain extent diminished the risks of famine; so that in case a severe famine should visit India in future, there is every probability of a smaller expenditure than 15 crores, which the Famine Commission estimated as the average for a single famine. The excuse is plausible. But the obligation to provide 1½ crores from the annual revenues is a wholesome one. It tends to check the Government's extravagance. The reduction of the amount from 1½ to 1 crore must, from this point of view, be considered as mischievous. In fact, the difference has already been used, or is to be used, for the purposes of the military department, which is never tired of producing cut and dry schemes to swamp whatever revenue it can lay hold of. This time the mobilisation scare has been raised, though no possible enemy on the Hindu Kush is expected, and the Russians are smoking their *hooka* of peace on the other side of the Oxus.

Not even a Pinch of Salt.

"Thus," our correspondent continues, "the half crore withheld from the Famine Insurance Fund goes into the bottomless pit of military finance. How much the masses would have appreciated a remission of the salt duty even to the extent of 4 annas per maund! On the first easement of the finances the Government, without any forebodings of conscience, remitted 1½ per cent. of the cotton duties at the behest of Lancashire, but now that an actual surplus, even after that unrighteous remission, can be shown, it refuses to give to the poor relief even to the extent of a larger pinch of salt, the consumption of which has diminished since the enhanced duty was established in 1888. Yet Lord Dufferin in open Council proclaimed that the duty should go as soon as the finances permitted. Another evil arising from the contraction of the Famine Fund to a crore is this. The Fund was partially employed in the reduction of debt. The incentive to reduce debt, even by a half a crore per year, has now apparently ceased to exist. Moreover the diminution of the grant to the Fund is irregular and a breach of faith. The income tax is levied for this very Fund, having superseded the original Licence tax of 1878 when the Famine Fund was established. The diversion of the residue to the purposes of the military department is greatly to be regretted. But the Government of India seems to have no regard for native opinion, and goes on in its march. For the moment, perhaps, the sky looks a little brighter, but when it may darken again one cannot say. Even before the ink was dry upon the the Budget, exchange, which for two weeks had ruled at 1s. 2 1/16d., went down to 1s. 2 1/32d. Such are the uncertainties of exchange. It supplies alike a convenient excuse when the finances are depressed by other causes, and a convenient opportunity of making ducks and drakes with any surplus that may accrue."

The Chitral Papers.

The student of "ways that are dark, and tricks that are vain," will find some interesting reading in the further "Correspondence Relating to the Occupation of Chitral," recently issued as a Parliamentary White-Paper. The Correspondence shows, among other things, how wide of the mark were the wiseacres who declared that the occupation of Chitral would not involve any additional expense nor any breach of the now famous proclamation issued by the Viceroy when the expedition was undertaken against Umra Khan. On January 15th last the Government of India forwarded to Lord George Hamilton estimates — only estimates, be it observed — of the "probable annual extra military expenditure involved by the occupation of Chitral and the line of communication." Here is the little bill:

	Occupation of Chitral. Rs.	Line of Communication. Rs.
Pay	192,000	300,000
Commissariat	300,000	480,000
Transport	28,000	14,000
Movement of Troops and Stores	121,000	170,000
Clothing	97,000	93,000
Ordnance	3,000	12,000
Medical	19,000	32,000
Miscellaneous	26,000	12,000
Telegraph	—	50,000
Postal	22,000	72,000
Total	808,000	1,235,000
Add 10 per cent. for contingencies	80,800	123,500
Grand Total	888,800	1,358,500
Or, in round figures ..	890,000	1,360,000
		2,250,000

"These estimates," adds the Government of India, with unconscious humour, "may require slight amendment hereafter if certain additional concessions to the troops which are now under consideration, are sanctioned." Moreover:

"in addition to this sum, the expenditure in the Military Works Department on huts for the troops, defensive works, and the maintenance of the roads will probably amount to Rs. 100,000 a year for the next two years. The probable political expenditure is estimated at Rs. 200,000 annually, but the present political arrangements are tentative and liable to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

reconsideration next May. The total approximate extra expenditure will, therefore, be annually Rs. 2,550,000. The estimates of military expenditure do not include the cost of retaining the 34th Pioneers temporarily on the Malakand, which we propose to do for six months next year. The extra cost on this account is estimated at Rs. 145,000."

Mr. Balfour had not these figures before him when he rashly stated that "the expense of the operation is one which is absolutely insignificant." He knew nothing of what Sir J. Westland describes as a "legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral." As for the proclamation, which announced that "the Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes," the Foreign Secretary telegraphed from Simla to Sir R. Low, as early as August 10th last, that the "Malakand will be held by a brigade, the crossing of the Swat river by a battalion." When further instructions were given to Sir R. Low, he was graciously requested to "point out to the tribes that the present proposals in no way depart from the terms of that proclamation." The process of "pointing out" is more fully described towards the end of the letter :—

"It is not to be expected that these objects can be attained by payments rigidly cut down to the amount of the monthly pay drawn by the levies employed. The goodwill of the tribes is an important factor in the case, and it cannot be ensured without fair and liberal dealing towards the leading men of each section and towards the Chief of the whole line within each tribe's limits."

Hence, of course, the expenditure stated above. Similarly, Major Deane, reporting last September his arrangements with the Khan of Dir, wrote :—

"The total thus amounts to Rs. 54,990 and a further sum of Rs. 5,010. . . . is estimated for payment to individual headmen of the tribes for services as occasion may demand. *This item is absolutely necessary.*"

After this it is mere waste of ink and paper to print in an appendix a collection of petitions from the headmen of native tribes praying for incorporation. These petitions, which the most ordinary "political" officer can of course obtain to order in small or large quantities at the shortest notice, might, we think, have been taken as read. To print them is to carry a joke too far. Besides, it discloses a lack of artistic restraint.

A Blundering Agreement.

The new batch of Chitral papers includes the text of the agreement that was made in November, 1893, between the Amír and the Government of India, represented by Sir H. Mortimer Durand. The third clause of this agreement, which is another piece of conclusive evidence that the Government of India had designs upon Chitral long before Dr. Robertson and his force got into difficulties there, contains the following provisions :—

"The British Government thus agrees to His Highness the Amír retaining Asmar and the valley above it, as far as Chanak. His Highness agrees on the other hand, that he will at no time exercise interference in Swat, Bajaur, or Chitral, *including the Arnawai or Bashgal valley.*"

Here, and in the disastrous consequences of the blunder, we see a characteristic incident in the reckless and ruinous "forward" policy. There is, it turned out, no such place as "the Arnawai or Bashgal valley." On the contrary as Lord George Hamilton had to explain in the House of Commons on April 16th :—

"When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai valleys ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east, and the Bashgal river from the west. *The frontier was therefore revised and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír the Bashgal valley*, which is west of the Kunar river, and *over which the Mehtars of Chitral have claimed rights.*"

A pretty commentary, this, upon the skill of the "experts" who, since the reversal of Lord Lawrence's policy, have been squandering the blood and treasure of India in a series of baneful enterprises beyond her north-west frontier.

The "Forward" Policy in Practice.

The subject is more fully set forth on another page. Here we will call attention to two points, and two points only, in connection with this triumph of Anglo-Indian diplomacy. It is clear, in the first place, that the Government of India believed that the Bashgal valley "over which the Mehtars of Chitral had claimed rights" was included in the territory of Chitral. But they made a mistake in their description of it, and the Amír was able to advance a claim to the valley. In the second place, it is clear that, this claim having been advanced by the Amír, the Government of India acceded to it, although they knew, or ought to have known, that it would lead to the massacre, or the enslavement and the unspeakable degradation, of the fair Kafirs who inhabited that region. Such is the "forward" policy in practice. In order to secure a military post at Chitral, the Government of India hand over to the tender mercies of the Amír the inhabitants of the Bashgal valley—and how tender those mercies are we may judge from Reuter's grim statement (somewhat Bowdlerised by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons) that the Amír "is treating *submissive* Kafirs with extreme leniency." Yet it was of this "forward" policy that Lord George Hamilton permitted himself to say in the House of Commons on February 17th :—

"Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. *He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned.*"

It is inconceivable that Lord G. Hamilton was then ignorant of the blunder in the Durand agreement.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The agreement was only made public because its publication was insisted upon in the House of Commons. Then the blunder was detected. If the agreement had been published in 1893, the worst consequences of the blunder might have been averted. Viewed as a whole, the expedition to Chitral, together with the manœuvres that preceded and the consequences which have followed it, is an apt epitome of the "forward" policy. That policy, which reverses the earlier and saner frontier policy of Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Ripon, is not only useless but positively dangerous. Strategically, it throws away the natural advantages of India's mountain barrier, and literally paves the way for the invader. Financially, it lies at the root of India's embarrassments. Morally, it is responsible for such incidents as the invasion of Kafiristan, and for heaven knows how much demoralisation besides.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee.

In spite of the reverses of the last General Election the Indian Parliamentary Committee will, it is plain, continue to be an important factor in the House of Commons. We referred last month to the invitation which Sir W. Wedderburn had sent to new members of the House of Commons to join the Committee, and we printed the names of the thirty-three gentlemen who had accepted the invitation. To these we have now the pleasure of adding the names of Mr. W. Allan, Dr. Cameron, Mr. A. E. Hutton, Mr. J. H. Maden, Mr. E. J. C. Morton, Mr. J. C. Rickett, and the Hon. Philip Stanhope. Thus, up to the present time, forty of the new members have joined the Indian Parliamentary Committee, bringing its total strength to the respectable figure of 125. No Government and no majority can ignore the representations of so large a section of the House of Commons. Within this larger body there is, as our readers are aware, a smaller Working Committee, which consisted originally of Messrs. W. S. Caine, J. E. Ellis, J. G. Swift MacNeill, W. S. B. Maclaren, Dadabhai Naoroji, J. H. Roberts, C. E. Schwann, S. Smith, H. J. Wilson, and Sir W. Wedderburn. Mr. Caine, Mr. Maclaren, Mr. Naoroji, and Mr. Webb are no longer members of the House of Commons, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee met on April 21st, in one of the Committee Rooms of the House of Commons, to elect their successors. The choice of the Committee fell upon Dr. Clark, Sir John Leng, Mr. C. P. Scott, and Mr. Robinson Souttar, who have consented to act, and who will bring to the Working Committee the very highest qualifications. In "Our London Letter" we give some account of their careers. The people of India may well congratulate themselves upon having secured such valuable allies and spokesmen in the House of Commons.

The Cotton Duties.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, formed in July, 1893, is really a revival of the informal Indian Committee which, in 1883, with the help of Mr. John Bright, sought to secure "combined Parliamentary action in matters affecting Indian public interests." Mr. Bright's committee, in its turn, was a revival of the the Indian Reform Society, founded in 1853, chiefly through the exertions of Mr. John Dickenson, for the purpose of promoting combined and well-directed action among the friends of India, and especially of securing full and impartial enquiry before the renewal of the charter of the East India Company in 1854. By joining the Indian Parliamentary Committee a member does not pledge himself to support any particular measures, but "expresses his willingness to co-operate in favour of a just and sympathetic policy towards India." The appointment of Lord Welby's Commission, which is now enquiring into the administration and management of Indian expenditure, was due to the efforts of Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues, although the enquiry was not granted by Sir Henry Fowler in the form they asked. It seems probable that the efforts of the committee will next be directed towards readjustment of the Indian cotton duties. The case of the poorest class of Indian consumers had already been laid privately before Lord George Hamilton, and the Indian Parliamentary Committee on April 21st approved a memorial recommending and justifying an important modification of the new duties. We hope next month to print the text of the memorial, together with Lord G. Hamilton's reply. Meanwhile it may be assumed that the aim of the Committee is to secure the exemption from all duty, whether import or excise, of cotton cloths which do not contain any yarn of higher count than twenties. The grounds for this modification were set forth in our columns last month. The modification can, it is believed, be carried out by executive order, and, if Lord George Hamilton refuses to take the necessary steps, it is natural to anticipate that the question will be raised in the House of Commons. Nothing could be more absurd than the statement, to which some Anglo-Indian journals have given currency, that Sir W. Wedderburn and his friends have neglected the question of the cotton duties for the question of Chitral. So soon as the details of the new scheme became known, the India Office was approached with moderate representations of a friendly character. The battle may now shift to the open. If so, Lord George Hamilton will probably discover that the modification suggested by the Indian Parliamentary Committee is cordially supported by the members of his own party who are best fitted to form an opinion upon the subject.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

By PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

Sir James Westland has got into the region of surpluses—small indeed, and questionable, but still formal surpluses. The closed accounts for 1894-95 show a surplus of Rx. 693,000. The revised estimates for 1895-96 show a surplus of Rx. 951,000. The Budget estimate for 1896-97 anticipates a surplus of Rx. 463,000. On the face of the figures, then, the financial bark would seem to have run into smooth waters. Sir James Westland would appear to have at length established the solvency of India. He is prudent enough, however, to "refrain from any prophecies as to the future." For such reticence he has especially good grounds, and nobody knows it better than the Finance Minister himself. The fact is that his Budget has got comfortably balanced by sheer good luck. The rate of exchange has happened, in the teeth of all reasonable expectations, to prove favourable to him. The opium revenue, which had been heading downwards, took an upward turn. Even in military expenditure prices have been rather more accommodating; specific outlays have been curtailed or come to the end of a series, and the authorities have availed themselves more largely of manufactures in India. The run of luck is of course unreliable, and apart from the advantages of luck the helpful circumstances have many aspects of serious questionableness.

There is satisfaction in the announcement of the restoration of the Famine Insurance Fund, "with effect from the date of its suspension," even though the amount be reduced from Rx. 1,500,000 to Rx. 1,000,000. The plain and obvious intention of the Fund has been treated with a looseness of interpretation that is amazing, and explicable only by the *force majeure* of necessity. There is substance also in the contention that the dangers of famine have been so far met by the progress of intercommunication that a smaller sum will prove ample for all practical needs that can be fairly anticipated. Sir Charles Elliott, if we remember rightly, used to affirm with emphasis that a famine is now practically impossible; and it may be granted that famine could not now take such a wide and deadly grip of any province or district as it did some twenty years ago. Clearly, however, it is the duty of the Government to err, if error there must be, on the right side, in this momentous matter. The sharpness of the lesson is apt to get blunted in the imagination of a later generation of officials, and the hopefulness of the later remedies is perhaps not likely to be underestimated, especially under financial strain from other quarters.

It is difficult to regard with satisfaction any explanations of amelioration on the point of military expenditure. The re-armament, which has been going on for the last nine years, is said to be substantially completed; and so, with the ensuing year, will be the special defence works. But for how long will such completions stand good? Everybody agrees with the large generalities about keeping up a sufficient military force, and maintaining our position, and so forth. But it is the practical details that land us all in conflict; and with the military bent of mind unmodified and the memory of Chitral still fresh, it is too obvious that even a surplus that does not go beyond six figures will not be devoid of temptation to further adventures. It is hardly worth while now to worry over the details of the Chitral expenditure. They will have to be paid up some time, however they may be deftly distributed in the formal accounts and minimised to the public view. The Malakand garrison, we are told, is to be reduced by one battalion presently, and "it is confidently believed that further reductions will be possible within a short period." But why not reduce it altogether, and at once? The whole policy on which it rests is of less than no value to the country. "But for the mobilisation grant, the army expenditure will be less than it was last year." Yes, there is much virtue, no doubt, in "but for." And "but for" is always available, and always helps to gild the bitterness of the pill to those that are not wise before the event.

The repayment of the provincial contribution is a formal act of grace. We should like, however, to see the provincial governments with a firmer grasp over their little savings. The fund is but a small thing, even for a straitened treasury at Calcutta, and the looting of it is attended with suggestions that do not make for solidarity of co-operation and sentiment. The fine flourish of expansion in railway construction is also meant to tickle the ears of the groundlings. A large programme of railway capital expenditure, illustrated by imposing sums in seven figures, easily gives the impression of a very flourishing state of things and a grand energy of development. The fact, however, is not obtruded that the dividends on such railways will almost bodily be carted out of the country. Very few rupees from this source will find their way into the pockets of the native inhabitants. True, there is the advantage of their existence and their use; but, after all, the advantages come to be onerous from the public point of view. By the time that the natives are able to build railways from their own capital, there will be no lines left to build that are likely to be worth their while.

The cruel thing about the whole financial position is that the favourable aspects of it are not built up on the true and solid prosperity of the country. Part of it comes from fresh taxation piled upon taxation that seemed incapable of sustaining another tier. During the past ten years, new taxation has been imposed to the tune of very nearly sixty millions of rupees, necessitated to fill up the recurrent deficits of the period. To be sure, part of this total is explained by the increase of population—an explanation that really makes matters essentially worse—by extensions of the railways and irrigation works. In addition, there has been collected another sixty millions of rupees, by expansion of taxes already existing. Notwithstanding all this, the Government has been compelled to stop the famine insurance grant, even in a year of threatened famine, to appropriate the provincial reserves, and to get help from the chance rise of the rupee in order just to balance the Budget. At the same time, the salt tax—obnoxious as it is to all men—

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

has been levied with increased severity on an article of prime necessity to every native; and the land revenue has been squeezed with all the force applicable within the limits of openly expressed discontent of the population. To see the grievous operation of fiscal severities, it is but necessary to follow the statements set forth by Mr. Alexander Rogers in regard to the Presidency of Madras. There, in 1893-94, 209,517 notices for sale of property against land-revenue defaulters were issued, and 14,198 of the Government tenants were sold up. There has been no answer to Mr. Rogers. The Madras Government has been instructed to report to the Home Government. When is it going to report? What can it say in disproof of his figures? Or what possible explanation can reduce the sense of outrage? The formal balancing of the Budget is an exceedingly small matter in face of the actual facts of an oppressive and dangerous administration. The little loans keep coming out from time to time and never get wiped out; and every little loan helps to make the mickle debt of India ever mickler. And when the Budget is cleverly balanced, the loans are left in the background—unseen but pressing steadily and hopelessly.

VENEREAL DISEASES IN THE EUROPEAN ARMY IN INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR STUART, M.P.

An increase of venereal disease is taking place in the Indian Army, and certain ill-informed Members of Parliament and writers in the public press have jumped at the conclusion that this is due to the recent repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts in India, and some have even endeavoured to urge as a remedy the re-establishment of that discarded system. There could be no conclusion wider of the mark and no more inconsequent or fallacious remedy. This I shall now proceed to show.

I have before me the figures of venereal disease in the European Army in India since the year 1871—that is to say, from three years after the first introduction into that country in 1868 of the system variously known as the Contagious Diseases Acts, the lock hospital system, or the system of cantonment regulation. That system, as is now well known, involved the compulsory registration and periodical examination of women, with all the attendant abominations which were exposed in 1888 and again in 1894, when the departmental committee sat which reported on the inefficient manner in which the repeal ordered by the House of Commons in 1893 had been carried out. In these figures the first important thing to be noticed is the continuous advance of these diseases in the Indian Army over the whole period of twenty-four years. The second thing to be noticed is that that advance is in no sense peculiar to the period which has elapsed since the resolution of the House of Commons in June, 1888, which ordered the abolition of the Contagious Diseases Acts. If you take the whole period from 1871 to 1894, the rise has been from 197 to 516 annual entries into hospital per 1,000 men, but the largest portion of this rise—viz., from 197 to 371, took place between 1871 and 1888, the portion of the period during which the Acts were in full force. It is obviously quite impossible from such figures to contend that the increase in the later years is due to repeal.

The Army Sanitary Commission—the chief hygienic authority in the British army—fully corroborates this conclusion. Attention having been called in 1893 to the increase of disease, and an outcry having been made for the reimposition of the Acts, or, as they are also called, the lock hospital system, the facts were laid before that Commission by Lord Kimberley, then Secretary of State for India, and the Commission made a special report. Lord Kimberley sums up that report, which was presented in December, 1893, in the following words:

"The conclusion at which they arrive is that this system has in India proved a failure and that its reinstitution cannot consequently be advocated on sanitary grounds."

In the following year, 1894, the Army Sanitary Commission repeated this statement—namely, that:

"The reintroduction of the lock hospital system in India on sanitary grounds could not be recommended."

And again, under date 19th June, 1895, in their most recent utterance, to be found in the first issued report on sanitary measures in India, they say (page 169):

"Venereal diseases prevail to a lamentable extent as they have done for years. . . . . It is hard to conceive a more unsatisfactory state of things in every way; but how it is to be remedied is a problem which we confess we have been altogether unable to solve. After much consideration we recommended certain measures which we understand are as far as possible to be acted on, and we trust that at least some benefit may be derived from them; but we have not recommended the re-establishment of lock hospitals partly because we are well aware that any recommendation of the kind would be a mere waste of time, and still more so because the beneficial results of lock hospitals in India during the time they were in force fell far short of what had been anticipated, and are not such as to favour their being revived."

The recommendations here referred to are summed up by the Commission themselves in the following words:

"We believe that the best practicable means of diminishing the prevalence of these diseases is to be found in establishing a system of voluntary lock hospitals and in providing the soldier as far as possible with healthy occupation and recreation."

These views have certainly not yet been adopted generally in India. It is not probable that they will be adopted until the officials have made up their minds to cease from hankering after the re-establishment of the old and condemned system. The Commission makes the following pregnant statement:

"No doubt the increase in the proportion of young soldiers and the decrease in the proportion of married men, as well as the fact that a much larger proportion of the men are new to the country, have had their influence on the results, and have tended to increase the amount of diseases of this class."

At the present moment the moral atmosphere into which we plunge the young and inexperienced men whom we send out as soldiers to India is very grievous. Though the brothel is, since the departmental order of 1894, now no longer registered and licensed inside of the cantonment itself, it is still close at hand,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and often only technically outside. The authorities still look to its sanitation as the sole means of securing health. They will never succeed—experience shows they will never succeed—till they take a new line and aim at attracting the soldiers from, instead of to, that institution.

The Indian authorities might well take a lesson from the condition of things in the home army. There repeal and its consequences have been honestly accepted, with the result that venereal disease, which rose while the Acts were in force, is now steadily on the decline. This will be made evident if we compare the following years: First, the three years succeeding the adoption of the Acts; second, the last three years in which they were in operation; and third, the three years just completed after they have been repealed for a dozen years:—

Year.	Cases per 1,000 Men.
1870	201·0
1871	201·5
1872	202·2
1880	245·9
1881	245·5
1882	246·0
1892	201·2
1893	194·6
1894	182·4

These figures sufficiently show the complete fallacy of imagining that disease is diminished by the presence of the Contagious Diseases Acts, and bear out the conclusions of the Army Sanitary Commission, which, indeed, in quoting the statistics in England, concludes by the observation that

"These figures suffice to show how very little influence the Acts would have had in diminishing venereal disease under conditions more favourable to their operation than those which exist in India."

I will conclude with only one further remark. Disease in the home army of England has diminished markedly during the ten years which have succeeded repeal. In India it has increased during the six years which have succeeded repeal in that country. How is it possible, under these circumstances, to lay the increase in India to the door of repeal? On the contrary, these facts amply bear out the conclusions at which Mr. Samuel Whitbread's committee arrived in 1862, when, after a careful consideration of the operation of such laws in various places, they reported that there was no evidence that any diminution in disease was connected with compulsory regulations. It would have been well if the authorities of that time had accepted the report of that committee; but they did not, and they tried a long experiment of regulation, ending in repeal, and have left it to the Army Sanitary Commission, after an examination of the results of that regulation and repeal in India and in England, to make the statements we have already quoted, which entirely corroborate the views of the committee of 1862. It is abundantly evident, therefore, that other methods than the re-introduction of the lock hospital system must be found for mitigating the disease in the Indian army.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

THE DUTY OF THE LIBERAL PARTY TOWARDS INDIA.

By A. G. SYMONDS, M.A.

No part of the Empire has more cause to regret the result of the General Election last year than India. Not only did many of its best friends in the last Parliament lose their seats—chief amongst whom was that true "Member for India," Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji—but the vast majority of the newly elected members, especially amongst the Conservatives, belong to the class which is most ignorant of India, least sympathetic with the desires and needs of its inhabitants, and most inclined to regard the country as only a special preserve for its younger sons and needy relations to make fortunes in and to get pensions from. They are the people who think and speak of all the natives of India as "black men" or "niggers;" who, if they have ever been out there, describe the country as "a beastly hole;" who scoff at the idea of the natives ever being capable of self-government even in the smallest municipal or parochial affairs; who assert that they have double the vices and none of the virtues of white men; and who believe in their inmost hearts that God only created the peoples of India for the special purpose of being governed by Englishmen. This is the class which for its own selfish ends and advancement is always ready to promote or support any military movement for which India has to pay, and steadily resists all attempts to reduce the expenditure on its administration. Most of these new Conservative M.P.'s have been educated at our Public Schools and Universities; but they know far less of the history and geography of India than of ancient Greece and Rome. Ignorance, lack of sympathy, and racial pride and prejudice, form the outfit of at least four-fifths of the men to whom the electors of England have entrusted the duty of governing themselves and the millions of their fellow-subjects in India and the Colonies.

But while I make this strong indictment against the great majority of the Conservative party I do not think that the Liberal party, either in or out of Parliament, is free from blame. Our leaders in both Houses have, with a few notable exceptions, been content to accept the official statements made with regard to Indian affairs without criticism, much less condemnation; and the rank and file of the party have followed their lead with blind unquestioning confidence, or have abstained altogether from taking part in the debates and divisions on Indian questions. The few men who have held official positions in India are listened to with scant attention; and others who have honestly tried to get to know something about India, either by visiting the country or by careful study of papers and publications dealing with Indian questions, are all set down as so many "Padgett, M.P.'s." The debate on the Indian Budget—which is always relegated to the latter end of the Session—is a dreary and perfunctory affair, and the benches on both sides of the House of Commons are scantily occupied. Indeed, I only remember one instance during the past twenty years when there was a crowded House to hear a debate

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

on a subject affecting India, and that was on the day when Sir Henry James moved his resolution about the Cotton Import Duties; and then it was the interests of Lancashire and the fate of the Liberal Government that made members on both sides respond to the summons of the Whips, and not the interests of India.

Now this very instance both explains why India is so neglected, and suggests the remedy. No question will command attention in Parliament until the fate of Governments depend on it, *i.e.*, until it becomes a "party" question; and the constituencies will not take much interest in any question, and certainly will not trouble their representatives about any question, which has not in it the elements of a party fight. It may be a "counsel of perfection" to keep matters of Foreign and Colonial policy and those which affect India clear of party prejudice and heat; but an experience of five and twenty years of active political life has led me to the conclusion that this is only partially possible, and that the effect of it is merely to deprive such matters of the interest and the motive force which party strife has the tendency to create.

I am strengthened in my opinion on this point both by a comparison of the advance made by movements which have been taken up as party questions with those which have been professedly non-party movements, and also by the simple and obvious consideration that reform and progress can and do come only from the efforts of a party, and that the Liberal party.

I hold, therefore, very strongly that if we wish to see the changes and reforms brought about in the civil and military administration of India which have been advocated in this journal, we must get the Liberal party as a whole to adopt them as part of its creed and programme. And as a Liberal I urge that it is the duty of my party to take up these questions, and to strive for reform in the government of India as it has fought for reform in the government of Great Britain, and as it is now pledged to to fight for reform in the government of Ireland. It is consonant with the principles of Liberalism that the demands made by the friends of India in the interests of the people of India should be supported by the party both in Parliament and the country. These demands—which were embodied in the request for a Commission made by Mr. Samuel Smith and others in the late Parliament—ask for an enquiry into the condition and needs of the people of India, their ability to bear the financial burdens which now press upon them so heavily, the nature of the revenue system, the possibility of reductions in civil and military expenditure and in the home charges, and of a readjustment of the financial relations now existing between the Indian and the Home Government. These demands ought to be pressed and supported with the whole strength of the Liberal party in Parliament, and full information with regard to them should be supplied to the constituencies by means of lectures and literature of a popular kind. With all its faults, the English nation loves justice and hates oppression; and if only its eyes were opened to the true state of things in India, it would support the demand for just and necessary reforms in that country as it has done in the case of Ireland. But there is need for a systematic and energetic propaganda, which ought to be undertaken by the great organizations of the party, worked through the local associations and clubs, and supported by speakers and writers who know their subject thoroughly. Lectures illustrated by limelight views and pictures, and small meetings in clubs where a lecture can be easily supplemented by conversational questions and answers, are far more effective than great meetings addressed by five or six prominent speakers. Especially important is it that natives of India who are resident in this country should go about amongst the working classes—as the Irishmen did in the earlier stages of the Home Rule agitation—and familiarize them with the leading facts and features of Indian life, and make them feel that they are not aliens and strangers, but fellow-subjects, as much interested in, as they are entitled to, good government, equal laws, and simple justice. It is the unknown that is always exaggerated, and the majority of Englishmen who oppose even moderate reforms, do so from fear lest any change should be for the worse. If this be the case with matters near home—whether in Great Britain or Ireland—how much more likely is it to be the case with matters so remote as the condition and administration of a distant and—to the bulk of the electors, unknown country like India. It is knowledge that is needed to secure the reforms we advocate; that knowledge can and must be supplied, as political knowledge always has been supplied, by organised work; and that work it is the duty of the Liberal party to do.

LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT IN MADRAS

II.

BY ALEXANDER ROGERS.
Late of the Bombay Civil Service.

In order to show the feasibility of a practically accurate, although not scientific, system of classification of soils, I now propose to describe that which has been satisfactorily carried out, and is still adopted, in the Bombay Presidency.

In the first place, the determination of whether a soil belongs to a certain order, such as the Madras "ferruginous" or "arenaceous," or the subdivisions of "clay," "loam," or "sand," is not left in the hands of lowly paid classifiers. If there happen to be in the same district two or more classes of soil of clearly varying natural fertility which require different methods of treatment to make them respond equally to the labour of the agriculturalist, the distinction is drawn by the heads of the Settlement department on general considerations. For instance, in the Province of Gujarat there are two visibly different varieties of soil, viz., the *kâli*, or black, and the *gorâru*, or white. It is found that the former is naturally more fertile, and requires less labour and less artificial stimulus in the shape of manure, than the latter to place the two on an equal footing for agricultural purposes, and in order to equalise the value of the two, the highest value, 16 annas, in the *gorâru* is considered equivalent to 14 annas in the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

white, the effect being that when a money assessment is imposed, say at a maximum of two rupees an acre, the best black would pay that rate while the best white would be assessed at 1r. 12as. The greater expense of cultivating the white is thus allowed for *ab initio*, and is not left for determination by the classifier. The method, of course, is arbitrary, but it is practically sufficiently accurate to place the two kinds of soil on an equality for the purpose of assessment. The classifiers in a district being thus started on the same path by authority, their further proceedings may be best exemplified by asking the reader to look at his own hand with the fingers stretched out parallel to each other. The middle finger, the longest, is then his 16 anna soil. The third finger, the next in length, having more sand or more gravel or other ingredient which makes it less productive, is put down to 15½ annas. The first finger, the third in length, goes down to 15 annas on account of its containing rather more of the same or other unfertile ingredients. The little finger for similar causes goes down to 14 annas. The thumb, the shortest, goes down to eight, that is, is reckoned as of half the value of the middle finger. The gradations between these severally may be counted on the joints of the fingers, and the reasons for this lowering are recorded in the case of each field by conventional signs, so as to be capable of being tested at any time by the classifier's official superior, generally a European Assistant Superintendent, or the Superintendent himself. In order to ensure equality of work, the whole of the classifiers of an establishment are worked together in the field by one or more superior officers, so that the same standard of lowering classification according to visible faults may be preserved throughout. Thus the value of the soil of every field is referable to that of the best soil in the district under classification, without the distinction of "ferruginous," "arenaceous," "alluvial," etc.

In irrigated lands the classifier has to note down the nature of the water supply, the depth of the water in a well and its level from the surface, its quality (that is, whether it is sweet, or salt, or brackish) and its ordinary duration (that is, whether it fails in the hot weather or not), and the possibility of the supply being supplemented from tanks, wells, etc., all of which particulars are capable of test by his superior officer. The only other duty a classifier has to perform is to mark down against each field its distance from the village site and water, which can be ascertained from the village map, and to take a census of the inhabitants and agricultural stock of the village. It will thus be seen how little real latitude is left in the hands of the classifier and how nearly it can be tested, as it periodically is, by the head of his office.

We now come to the assessment. It will be seen from what has been said above that the duty of the Settling Officer is to determine primarily a maximum rate for each district, the assessment on individual fields following this in a descending scale according to the classification of their soils, the maximum for different groups of villages, subordinate to that for the district as a whole, varying according to the settling officer's judgment with their position with reference to markets and climate. The assessment of individual fields, moreover, varies with reference to their distance from the village sites, those close to villages being probably raised on account of the greater ease with which they can be watched and manured, and those at a distance lowered on account of liability to depredation by wild animals and greater difficulty of manuring, etc. This enables the Settling Officer in his discretion to allow for the general absence of agricultural skill among certain classes over others—as between Kolis and Kunbis in Gujarát, for instance. Such discrimination is perfectly legitimate, but it is not left in the hands of subordinates like the classifiers, and cannot be known or arranged for by them with the cultivators, as it can under the Madras system already explained.

The most critical point for the exercise of the Settling Officer's judgment is the fixing of the maximum rate for a district. The Madras Manual apparently deprecates a reference to former assessments and realizations of revenue for this purpose. Now, to my idea this is the most infallible test of all of the success or otherwise of the revenue administration. If, under it, cultivation and prosperity, as shown by the regular payment of the demands of the State, without recourse to coercive processes such as are apparently the rule and not the exception in Madras, have increased, we may be sure that the assessment has been fair, and property in land has acquired a market value. If, on the contrary, coercive processes have had to be resorted to for the realization of the revenue, and the cultivation of the land has fallen off, the rewards of agriculture have not proved sufficient to induce people to hold on to their lands. In Bombay, in most parts where there is a tolerably dense agricultural population, waste land is hardly obtainable; in Madras there are nearly three and a half million acres of assessed land lying waste. By such considerations, and the probability of a rise or fall in the value of agricultural produce, the Settling Officer must be guided in fixing a maximum rate which, when calculated on the average classification of soils—that is, their ascertained relative fertility, will ensure to the State an equitable revenue, realizable, under the ordinary circumstances of a fair season with an average rainfall, without any general recourse to coercive processes, and offer to the individual cultivator an inducement to hold to his property in the soil, notwithstanding the usual vicissitudes of the seasons. When this is not the case, a cultivator may only find it worth his while to take up land for a season or two, and pay for it as long as the extra fertility it has derived from lying fallow may last, then throwing it up; but in Bombay, where the rates are not rack-rents, but are fixed sufficiently low to leave the cultivator a landlord's profit if he desires to sublet his land or let it lie fallow, no man dares throw up his land for fear of someone else taking it up over his head.

The examination of each village by the Settling Officer inculcated in the Madras Manual points to an assessment fixed in a haphazard way according to the external appearance of each, without reference to it, with regard to accessibility to markets and the certainty or otherwise of the rainfall. I

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

have been told that these points are taken into consideration in Madras, and hope they are: otherwise two very important points are omitted. But it is a fact that such consideration is not ordered in the Manual.

One word in conclusion as to the administration of a settlement when made. A great deal of its success or otherwise depends on the proper fixing of the instalments by which the revenue is collected. They should, with a view to keep the rayats out of the hands of unscrupulous money lenders, be fixed from a month to six weeks after the ordinary time for the harvesting of the predominant crops of each village. It would be oppressive to expect the people who harvest the greater part of their produce in February or March to pay an instalment in December, as if their staple crop was rice. I hope I have clearly made out the difference between the Madras and the Bombay systems, but I shall be happy to discuss the subject further with any one disposed to do so.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE LEAGUE.

BY J. DACOSTA.

A political Association bearing the above name is being formed in London with the proclaimed object of securing the permanent unity of the British Empire, and a circular issued by it in March last appealed for public support on the ground that "the events of the previous few weeks had emphasised the importance of its object." The events thus ominously adverted to were, as it soon afterwards appeared from Mr. Chamberlain's speech at the Canada Club dinner on March 25, the hostile attitude assumed by the United States of America, and the danger it involved to our North American Colonies. The means by which the League proposes to accomplish its object are:

(i) To promote trade between the United Kingdom, the Colonies and India, through periodical meetings of representatives from all parts of the Empire;

(ii) To consider how far laws and treaties might be modified which impede the making of reciprocal trade arrangements;

(iii) To promote closer intercourse by improving the means of communications;

(iv) To develop the principles by which all parts of the Empire may best share in its defence, and devise a more perfect co-operation of the military and naval forces for the protection of the trade routes; and

(v) To assimilate the laws relating to copyrights, legitimacy and bankruptcy throughout the Empire.

These various ends doubtless commend themselves to the nation at large excepting reciprocal trade to which a very large majority is opposed on the ground that it violates the principles of free trade and sanctions the imposition of Custom's duties for political purposes. The League proposes to overcome that opposition through a compromise which would establish free trade between the parts of the Empire, and reciprocal trade in our commerce with foreign countries. The proposed system would thus be simple and intelligible, but for the many exceptions by which it is to be modified, as explained in the following sentences of Mr. Chamberlain's above-mentioned speech:—

"Let us not minimise the proposition we are asked to consider. It would involve in the case of the United Kingdom a most serious disturbance in our trade; it would be a great change in the principles which for many years have guided our commercial policy. It involves the imposition of a duty upon food and upon raw material, and the tendency of imposing such a duty would be to increase the cost of living, which would of course increase the pressure upon the working classes of this country. That cannot be denied, and it would have the tendency to increase the cost of productions, which would put us of course in a worse position than we are now in, in our competition with foreign countries in neutral markets. There is also this startling proposal for a free trade country to consider—one that in its present form it is impossible for us to adopt; not merely because it is contrary to free trade principles; for I am myself a convinced free trader, and believe that the theory is undoubtedly the theory on which the world would become most prosperous; but I have not such a pedantic admiration for it that, if sufficient advantage were offered to me, I would not consider a deviation from the strict doctrine. We cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco or in those articles which, in one part of the Empire or another, are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might be excluded from the proposed arrangement."

It clearly appears from these statements that the action of the League is to be governed, not by any fixed and acknowledged policy, but by conflicting principles subject to exceptions such as expediency might suggest. Great Britain would no longer be a free trade country, but would at once be drawn, by the exigencies of reciprocal trade, into a war of Customs tariffs with the United States, France and Russia, whence we largely draw our supplies of food and raw material.

In short, as Mr. Chamberlain observed, the proposal involves additional burdens on our working classes and our manufacturing industry, and it withdraws from our colonies the much-valued power they have hitherto exercised of adjusting their Customs tariffs according to their financial necessities, as affected by their respective situations. The task undertaken by the League may, therefore, be arduous and complicated, and their labours might become seriously, if not indefinitely, prolonged.

The proposed meetings of representatives from all parts of the Empire might certainly facilitate agreement on many important points; but even such a result can be expected only if the rules, which are adopted for the selection of the representatives and for the apportionment of their influence over the decisions of the League, are founded upon acknowledged principles of fairness. But nothing has transpired on these all-important points, nor is it known whether a numerical proportion is to be observed between the representatives and the populations whom they are to represent.

In the selection of competent representatives, no great difficulty can arise in the colonies where the representative system of government obtains. But how about India, the largest of our dependencies, and her 250,000,000 of industrious and law-abiding children?

India is governed despotically by a body of officials alien in race, religion, and interests to the people of the country, and acting at the dictation of a Secretary of State in London, who is personally

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

unacquainted with India and is strongly influenced by the aims of the British Cabinet, which are sometimes diametrically opposed to the interests of the Indian people. Disregarding the dangerous anomalies involved in this combination, the promoters of the League, at their inaugural meeting on January 29, declared:—

"We include the Colonies as fully as the Mother Country, and we include India, which we are glad to know is prosperous and contented."

Now a very moderate acquaintance with India and a glance at the Indian press would suffice to show that India is neither prosperous nor contented.

Popular contentment cannot exist in a community where the administration of justice is tampered with by those who are charged with the protection of the people; and our judicial system in India, which empowers collectors of revenue and other executive officers to preside as judges in Courts of law, is well known to be a most prolific source of injustice and oppression. Government servants are thus allowed to sit in judgment over their own acts. Both Lords Kimberley and Cross have admitted that the system is contrary to good principle, alleging that financial difficulties alone are a bar to reform. It has long been a matter of notoriety that, under the vicious system in question, which violates the first principle of justice, redress for wrongs suffered at the hands of officials in India, is scarcely ever within the reach of the people.

That the assertion that India is prosperous is equally fallacious, will be seen at once, when it is remembered that her finances, ever since the inauguration of the present *régime* in 1858-61, have been in a chronic state of embarrassment. During the early part of that period, a faulty system introduced in connection with the construction of canals and other public works caused many millions to be embarked in unsound speculative enterprises, which failed to yield in every case the financial return which was expected, and, in a great many cases, any financial return at all, while India remained permanently burdened with the debts contracted for defraying the cost of those works. In more recent years her financial embarrassments arose chiefly from the costly wars waged against neighbouring tribal States, on the plea of defending our territories against a Russian invasion, the loans contracted for carrying on those unsuccessful wars having largely increased the public debt of India. Other causes supervened to aggravate the financial situation. The yield of the opium monopoly decreased and became precarious in consequence of the extension of opium cultivation in China. Thereupon the Government sought to retrieve its finances, not by reform and economy, but by increased taxation. The duty on salt has been raised to several hundreds per cent. on the value of that article in bond, and a powerful incentive to smuggling has thereby been afforded, resulting in inquisitorial and oppressive police regulations and in a demoralizing amount of bribery, extortion, and violent crime.

Furthermore the land tax, which, over the greater part of British India, is periodically revised and assessed so as to absorb, in a favourable season, nearly the entire produce of the land, leaves the cultivator, after an indifferent or a bad season, liable for arrears of revenue recoverable from future crops. Under these conditions the agricultural population, except in the limited area where the land tax has been permanently fixed, live in a chronic state of destitution and indebtedness, and perish in hundreds of thousands in the famines which desolate India. The periodical re-assessments of the land tax most effectually discourage the application of capital to the improvement of the soil, by rendering any fruit of the capital so applied liable to be absorbed in the tax at the next revision.

The obvious remedy for this calamitous state of things is the permanent limitation of the Government demand upon land, which would encourage the cultivator to expend capital in the improvement of his farm, and would enable him, after a good harvest, to lay by savings for tiding over seasons of drought or excessive rain. The financial embarrassments of the Government, however, have debarred the adoption of a policy urged alike by reason and justice; and the welfare and contentment of an industrious and intelligent people have been sacrificed to financial exigencies brought about by the mismanagement and extravagance of their rulers.

These deplorable effects of the waste of money in unsound public works and of a mischievous land policy were foreseen by Lord Salisbury, when he was directly connected with the Indian administration. Addressing the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in 1875, his lordship said:—

"My study of the subject of irrigation works has led me to the conviction that the works are not at all what they are represented to be: in most cases they have not answered their purpose and their financial results have been deplorable."

Later, speaking in Bradford in October, 1877, he said:—

"If we expend money rashly upon irrigation works which will not pay and cannot be used by the inhabitants, the interest of that money must be found out of taxes which must in the main be levied upon the peasant; and the end will be that, in order to save him from famine which comes once in twenty years, we would crush him under an increased burden of taxes which comes upon him every year. Depend upon it, the only true remedy against famine and scarcity is the frugality of the people. The people ought in years of plenty to make money enough to lay up for these times of famine."

Between the state of things which prevailed when those warnings were given and the present financial situation in India a direct connection will be found in the following passages of an article on "Indian Affairs" published in the *Times* of April 13, under the heading "The cost of the solvency of India":—

"That solvency has been achieved only by the continuous and heavy additions to the burdens of the people. New taxation to the extent of 60,000,000 rupees has been imposed during the past ten years. This must make all who wish well to *our rule* pause before they congratulate themselves on the result. The Budget statement shows that, between 1884-85 and 1895-96, 23,000,000 rupees has been levied on salt, a necessity of life; and that, during the same period the revenue levied on land has been increased by 43,000,000 rupees. If solvency, therefore, has been attained, it should not be forgotten what it has cost the Indian poor. The statements presented in Parliament in the form of questions to the Secretary of State still remain unanswered. They amount to a charge of fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency which, in a single year, 1894-95, led to the issue of 209,517 notices of sale of property against land-revenue defaulters, and to 14,198 Government tenants being sold up. Lord George Hamilton stated that the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Indian Government had been instructed to report on the matter. Yet we cannot forget that several years have elapsed since the question was raised, and that some years have also passed since the Government of Madras was directed to submit an explanation. Outstanding charges of this sort create an uneasiness as to what the progress of Indian measures really means to the people, and as to the measures by which Indian solvency has been attained."

To revert now to the British Empire League, it was announced at its inaugural meeting that the Duke of Devonshire had accepted the position of its President. An impression prevails, however, that *Reciprocal trade* (involving as it does the imposition of protective duties on the products of any country where similar duties are levied on British products) is repugnant to his Grace's views of commercial policy. It will be remembered also that Lord Salisbury, in replying to Lord Stanley of Alderley on the question of protective duties, said on February 24: "I conclude by reiterating my assertion that nothing that I have said can fairly be construed as an argument in favour of Protection." On the other hand the Duke of Devonshire is known to be well informed on the main features of our Indian administration. It may therefore reasonably be expected that the removal of the blots which disfigure that administration, will commend itself to his Grace as a step better calculated to promote the welfare, affirm the loyalty and strengthen the attachment of our Indian fellow-subjects to British rule, than the indirect means which are suggested in the programme of the League.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

HOW DISCUSSION IS STIFLED.

WHAT INDIAN CRITICS THINK.

A WARNING FOR OFFICIAL OPTIMISTS.

The Indian Budget—or, as it is officially termed, the Financial Statement, 1896-7—was introduced and explained by Sir James Westland in the Viceroy's Legislative Council on Thursday, March 19th. On the following Thursday, March 26th, the Council met again, and a portion of the sitting was devoted to discussion of the Budget. After disposing of it and some other business, the Council adjourned *sine die*.

That is to say, the Indian Budget, dealing as it does with an expenditure of well over a thousand millions of rupees, is dismissed in India at a single sitting, without amendment and without a division. Not only have the taxpayers of India no voice in determining the amount or the nature of the expenditure, but even the non-official members of the Council itself are debarred from putting a single question to the vote, or protesting effectively against a single proposal. They can only deliver a solitary speech upon the Budget as a whole, and their speeches, boycotted by the Anglo-Indian journals, are but voices crying in the wilderness.

The attention which the representatives of the Indian taxpayers receive at the hands of the Finance Minister may be judged from a single example. The absurdly perfunctory discussion of March 26th—the only discussion which will take place upon the Budget—Sir James Westland described one of his most competent critics as "a gentleman on the Bombay side who is under the delusion that he knows something about Indian finance, and has been making occasional attempts to induce the public to share his hallucination."

In due course, the Indian Budget will be considered in the House of Commons. In other words, a handful of members of Parliament, at the fag-end of the Session, will be invited to register the foregone conclusions which have been graciously laid before the Viceroy's Council. The House of Commons will merely be asked to declare that it appears from the accounts that the total revenue of India *for the year ending a year ago last March* was so-and-so, and the expenditure so-and-so. No effective division will be possible, and the opinions expressed by independent Indian critics will not be laid before Parliament.

It may be doubted whether human ingenuity could contrive a system more perfectly designed to preserve irresponsible power in the hands of those who call the tune, and to keep out of sight and out of mind the wants and wishes of those who pay the piper. Sir Henry Fowler is not a humourist. But he has perpetrated the grim sarcasm that all members of Parliament are members for India.

In these circumstances—circumstances which find their natural counterpart in the growing discontent of the Indian people, and the bitter despair of many of India's most able sons—it is of the highest importance to convey to the British public some notion, however inadequate, of the criticisms passed by Indians upon the expenditure which they only provide and are not permitted to control. We propose, therefore, to bring together a series of extracts from speeches delivered in the Legislative Council, and articles published in the Indian journals—premising, however, that the Indian Budget only touches the surface of Indian problems, which belong not to book-keeping but to policy.

THE FAMINE INSURANCE FUND.

Sir James Westland began his Financial Statement with the announcement that the Famine Insurance Fund (so long neglected for military aggression and compensation to officials) was to be restored. He had the assurance to describe the Government's obligation in respect to this Fund as "self-imposed." In the same spirit he stated that the Government would "meet all the necessary obligations" if they set aside, not 1½ millions sterling per annum, as originally agreed, but Rx. 1,000,000. The words in inverted commas appear in paragraphs 3 and 6. But in paragraph 75 Sir James Westland, with greater candour, describes the Government's present proposal as "the *partial* restoration of the famine grant." A considerable part of Mr. Ananda Charlu's speech was naturally taken up with this question. In the course of his speech, he said:

"I do not see why it is called a self-imposed obligation. It is, I believe, an obligation compulsorily thrust on the Government by the necessities and conditions inseparable from the administration of a country subject to repeated recurrences of famine, almost as a matter of course. If so, it is like all other obligations which are forced upon the Government by causes extraneous to its mere will and pleasure. If this has been

CC-0 Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

specialised as self-imposed in order to facilitate its suspension in the future, as has too often been done in the past, I must strongly object to it as the introduction of the thin end of the wedge to indicate an unsympathetic and radical change of policy."

Mr. Ananda Charlu then traced, as we have more than once traced in INDIA, the origin and history of the Famine Insurance Fund. We need only cite again the words used by Lord Lytton when fears were expressed on behalf of the people of India that, although special taxation was imposed to provide for the Famine Insurance Fund, the money so raised might not always be employed for that purpose. Lord Lytton said:

"I think I am entitled to point out to the Council that we are not now open to this customary criticism. We do not speak without having acted; and we promised nothing which we have not, after long and anxious consideration, provided ourselves with the means of performing. I must have very imperfectly explained myself thus far, if I have failed to make it clearly understood that I am not now speaking of what we ought to do, or would do, to insure this country against the worst effects of future famine, had we only the means of doing it; but of what we can do, and will do, with the means already provided for with the means now before the Council. I do not mean to say that the construction of such an extensive system of local railroads and irrigation works as we propose to undertake will not be the gradual task of many years. But I do mean to say that, in the manner and on the principle already explained, we are now providing for the prompt commencement and uninterrupted continuation of this great and necessary task. As the representative of the Sovereign of India, I regret that such language should have been held to me by you. The sole purpose of the taxation you complain of was the preservation of the lives of the people of India from the effects of famine. Whatever may be the faults or shortcomings of this Government, its action in the matter to which your address makes reference was dictated by the sincerest and most anxious desire to give the people of India the greatest protection which could practically be provided for them against the calamities of future famine. To insinuate the contrary is to insinuate a calumny."

PROMISE AND —— PERFORMANCE.

Mr. Ananda Charlu proceeded to quote in Lord Lytton's own words the undertakings into which the Government of India entered when the Fund was started and the special taxation imposed. The first and essential undertaking was to apply funds "at the rate of 1½ millions sterling per annum in such a manner as to create what shall be, in fact, an Insurance Fund, from which future expenditure for famine relief can be provided for without adding to the permanent burdens on the revenue." Placing these undertakings side by side with Sir James Westland's statement, Mr. Ananda Charlu said:—

"One cannot help reading between the lines, and noting, with profound sorrow, an ill-concealed disposition to starve this Fund in order to meet the cost of measures which are more or less dictated by the general obligation the Government is under to meet commercial or strategic needs and to develop the resources of the country, and which it is bound to undertake for their own sakes and quite apart from any relation to famines. These, for purposes of distinction and easy reference, I shall call non-famine Public Works, including both large irrigation measures and railway constructions. The phrase, 'measure calculated to prevent the recurrence of famine,' and the phrase, 'to facilitate measures of relief on its occurrence,' which are used by the hon. Finance Minister, are far too elastic and far too vague. Given a certain amount of skill and ingenuity, I do not know what measures could not be easily lugged into these categories, irrespective of all specifications in the past. Every railway construction, by affording easy transit for food grains, and every work of irrigation, by serving the same purpose and rendering the further service of watering more extended areas of cultivated land, must to some extent help to check famine, and might any day be declared to come under the latter of these words. What is the permanent differentia? Is it to be the will and pleasure of the holders of the portfolio for the time being?"

CHITRAL AND THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

Sir James Westland's references to the Chitral expedition were frequent and significant. His answer to the financial optimism of Lord G. Hamilton and Mr. Balfour is (para. 11) that:

"The Chitral expedition has cost us Rx.67,200 in the accounts of 1894-5, Rx.1,647,500 in the revised estimate 1895-6, and a further sum of Rx.20,000 will come under payment in 1996-7, giving a total of Rx.1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. *It has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications* which has involved in 1895-6 an expenditure of Rx.102,200, and will involve in 1896-7 an expenditure of Rx.231,700. . . . . The financial statement is not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition or the occupation which has followed it; and I have here merely to note the fact that against a Budget provision of Rx.150,000, which was announced as intended to meet the cost of preparation which it was hoped might not eventuate in war, we have expended Rx.1,749,700 plus £16,000, being an excess, omitting exchange, of Rx.1,615,700."

Sir James Westland adds, in a footnote, that these figures do not include "political" expenditure. Mr. Ananda Charlu agreed that the financial statement was not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition:

"I say, with greater propriety of language, that it is not of any avail (and therefore not fitting) that it should be discussed in this Council. But one single remark has, however, to be made in this connection, viz., that, owing to the accident of a recent change of Ministry in Great Britain five untoward results to India have ensued, viz.:

(1) The disappearance of a good slice of her previous income.
(2) The permanent addition to her already over-burdened expenditure by reason of retaining Chitral.
(3) The postponement of performance of a long-standing and deliberate promise to relieve her suffering poor by a reduction of the salt-tax.
(4) A fresh burden in the shape of taxation on the coarser goods which alone are available to the poor in the land; and
(5) A burden of 15 lakhs a year in the shape of interest on the loan of four crores that has been announced to be in immediate contemplation."

Again, at the close of his speech, Mr. Ananda Charlu added:

"Within these ten years this forward policy has cost us—apart from the wars themselves—an aggregate sum of nearly seventy crores, and has added to our permanent expenditure no less a sum than six crores per annum; and as for the Home Charges they have mounted up to over twenty-five crores of rupees. It is to meet drains such as these that the poor man's food and salt are reduced to famine rations and the hand of the tax-gatherer is laid even on his coarse and scanty raiment. This has been said, and said times out of number. The non-officials have said it, and they have been laughed at for their pains. But two predecessors of the Finance Minister of to-day have also said it with a full knowledge of the arcana of Indian finance. They have, with the trammels of office, thrown away the dead weight of reticence which sat heavily on their conscience while they held the official portfolio. They have discharged their conscience by boldly denouncing these as the true enemies of India. They too have been relegated to the limbo of disdain and scorn. This is the most unspeakable of India's misfortunes."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE ONE ALTERNATIVE—RETRENCHMENT.

We have not the space to do justice to the cogent criticisms which Ananda Charlu passed upon the remaining portions of the Budget. Sir James Westland's surplus is admittedly a windfall, the result of unexpected improvement in exchange. Indian critics are unanimous in calling attention to the instability of this foundation. Mr. Ananda Charlu's words were:

"This Budget is, indeed, an admirable feat. I can only describe it as an inverted cone, with its apex in the shifting sands of Exchange, with all the weight of this year's Indian prosperity mainly posed on that apex. That unstable foundation might any day discover sudden signs of giving way; and to prop up our inverted cone we might have to seize upon everything ready to hand, even to the extent of further straitening the poor man's food and clothing and his small savings. It behoves us, therefore, to see how to rehabilitate our Revenue and to place it on a sound, firm, and solid basis. There is but one alternative, and it is but to have the word Retrenchment largely writ and put in practice measures tending towards it. A mere cheeseparing policy will never do. The insatiate and never-ceasing demands of our Forward Policy must be attacked and overcome. Our ever-growing Home Charges must be considerably beaten down. If these are impracticable, then the sole remedy is for Great Britain to come out with a substantial contribution to alleviate India's burden."

SHEARING THE PROVINCIAL SHEEP.

Another matter to which Mr. Ananda Charlu referred was the policy of the Central Government in its dealings with the Provincial Governments. Paragraphs 60—64 of Sir James Westland's statement discussed this subject in a spirit which has caused natural anxiety throughout India. "It is," according to Sir James Westland, "curious that nearly every Province in India assumes that it is the possessor of a large surplus of revenue, and that only the necessity of maintaining the expenditure of other and poorer Provinces, or something which is vaguely termed 'Imperial necessities,' prevents its enjoying the full benefits of its own revenues." This "notion" Sir James Westland promised to "dissipate." Sir James Westland added that his statement upon this matter would serve as a "useful preliminary to the discussion of the assignments" he might find himself able to make in the new provincial contracts. This threat—for it was nothing else—drew down upon him the remonstrances not only of the Indian members of the Council but also of Sir A. Mackenzie, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. Sir A. Mackenzie complained that, Sir J. Westland's theories notwithstanding, the Supreme Government did not always realise that it had as great a responsibility for local administration as the local Government itself. Sir A. Mackenzie added:—

"I have seen, or seemed to see, a tendency on the part of that Government to wash its hands of this responsibility, especially as regards finance. I thought I saw this when, as Chief Commissioner of Burma, I protested vigorously against the mulct of 18 lakhs taken from that province in 1894-95, and which I am glad to see now given back. I know that my hon. friend will repudiate the idea, but I have, I believe, none the less seen it elsewhere also in operation, conscious or unconscious. I refer to it, however, now not by way of complaint about the past, but in order to enter a *caveat* in view of the revision of the Provincial contracts to which the hon. member alludes in his para. 64. I trust that he will enter upon this revision in full consciousness of the fact that the Local Government is as much interested in the development and improvement of Provincial Administration as the Provincial Governments themselves, and that any check inflicted on them is a check to the whole Imperial machine. I must say I deprecate the way in which these quenquennial reversions have too frequently been carried out. The Provincial sheep is summarily thrown on its back, close clipped and shorn of its wool, and turned out to shiver till its fleece grows again. The nominal history of a provincial contract is this: two years of screwing and saving and postponement of works, two years of resumed energy on a normal scale, and one year of dissipation of balances in the fear that, if not spent, they will be annexed by the Supreme Government at the time of revision. Now all this is wrong, not to say demoralising. I say that the Supreme Government ought not to sheer too closely each quinquennium. It is as much interested in the continuity of work as the local governments, and ought to endeavour to secure this and avoid extreme *bouleversements* of the Provincial finances. In the first two Provincial contracts India left Bengal not only its accumulated balance but part of its normal and recurring surplus. In the last three contracts it has taken the whole normal surplus, leaving Bengal to create a new surplus and make what it could out of the progressive growth of its revenues. This necessarily inflicts on the province at least two years of leanness at the outset of each quinquennium. It would be an immense gain to local administrations if the Government of India could see its way to renewing the contracts with as little change as practicable on each occasion. It is only in this way that the element of fiscal certainty, which was put forward in 1870 as one of the main objects of its decentralisation, can be secured."

WANTED: REMISSION OF TAXATION.

Mr. Bhuskate, another Indian member of the Council, joined in the attack upon the policy by which the contribution to the Famine Fund is to be reduced to one crore, and criticised the financial relations between the Supreme and the Provincial Governments. The rest of his speech is summarised as follows:

"He argued that the poorer provinces were made to contribute more than their proper share, in order that the richer provinces might not be taxed their full share of the Imperial contribution. He advocated the remission of the heavy additional taxation imposed during the past few years to meet the financial crisis. Relief should, in the first place, be given to the mass of the population. Speaking of the expenditure he referred to the great increase of military charges since 1885, which were wrongly attributed to the fall in exchange. Railways, too, he said had been built with little regard for cost. In this year's Budget the protective railways constituted the most important head of expenditure and most of them were constructed for protecting the North-Western frontier. The vigorous prosecution of railway construction had already largely added to the net loss to the State during the previous years. He also criticised the special grant for the mobilisation."

SUPREME DISREGARD OF POPULAR DEMANDS.

We turn from the speeches to the newspapers—though it is impossible within our limits of space to give more than a glimpse of the criticisms which pervade the journals of educated India. The *Indu-Prakash*, one of the most sober and thoughtful of Indian journals, published a long article criticising the Budget, point by point. "That the surpluses were not expected, and consequently no provision was made for lightening the burdens on the poor; that there was none in the Supreme Legislative Council to find the flaws in the Budget; that none of the members cared to discuss a policy which has often been discussed without profit; that the Government of India, in spite of a surplus, would not think of taking a general view of their position which is as essential in times of trouble as in times of prosperity; that Sir James Westland merely acts as an

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Accountant General and not as a Finance Minister intent on putting the Indian finance on a firmer basis; these matters will not be considered satisfactory by anyone except the Government of India and its financial adviser. By the rest of the civilised world they will be taken to indicate a supreme disregard on the part of the ruling authorities towards the wants and wishes of the subject races." On the subject of Famine Insurance Fund the *Indu-Prakash* said:—

"We are bound in justice to Sir James Westland to say that he has done one act of grace, though it is a partial one, by restoring the Famine and Insurance grant and charging it on the revenues. Thus in the accounts of 1894-95 and 1895-96 the grant again appears to the amount of a crore of rupees, most of it being charged partly under the Famine Relief and Insurance and partly under the Railway Revenue Account. When the Government took upon itself the obligation of setting apart every year £1,500,000 it levied the assessed taxes to meet the obligation. The Government, therefore, is bound at least to spend the whole amount it has received from the assessed taxes, if not £1,500,000 a year, on objects for which the fund was originally intended. But the Government has not met its obligations fully. Instead of continuing to fulfil its duty—for the Famine Insurance Fund is in the nature of a trust—the Government have actually cut down the annual grant by fully one-third, if we take the amount fixed originally to be in rupees, and by nearly a-half if we take the amount, as in fact it was, to be originally fixed in pounds sterling. This reduction of the grant, which Sir James wants the Government to make a permanent one, is not at all justifiable, considering the history of the measure and the state of the country."

THE LAND REVENUE: A "RELENTLESSLY EXACTING" SYSTEM.

In the opinion of the *Indu-Prakash* one of the chief blots on the picture drawn by Sir J. Westland is the Land Revenue:

"Apart from the question of rack-rent, it seems as if the revenue to be derived from land has reached its maximum limit. The bad seasons and famines, now in one district and then in another, whether called by their real name or not, tell their own tale. In spite of the highly scientific and relentlessly exacting system of collecting land revenue, the estimated income is not realised. In the Central Provinces, for instance, the Finance Minister does not expect, in spite of an increase of Rs.4,75,000 owing to revised assessments, the probable collections for the next year to come up even to the Budget estimates of this year."

THE HUGE MONSTER OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

Finally, the *Indu-Prakash* discusses with something like the resignation of despair the appalling burden of military expenditure:

"Of late it has grown without bounds, and one cannot tell when it will remain stationary. With the military party in the ascendant both in England and India, our poor country is fated to be crushed by the huge and heavy monster of military expenditure. Nearly the whole yield from the land revenue is to be spent on him, and still he seems to be as hungry as ever. This year it is the Chitral expedition which swells the bill. It is well to bring out here a fact which is worth noting. Lord George Hamilton during the first debate on Chitral glibly mentioned that the occupation of Chitral would not cost India additional expense. Mr. Balfour, too, said the same or similar thing. If they said this thing under instruction, we must blame the India Office; if they said it on their own authority we must charge them with a wanton negligence of their duty as ministers of Her Majesty the Queen. In any case, it is interesting to note that, apart from the expenditure incurred in connexion with the Chitral expedition, amounting to more than one crore and seventy-five lakhs of rupees, the occupation of Chitral and its communications will cost, under Army, Rs.19,22,000 this year and Rs.23,17,000 next year. 'The occupation also involves'—we are quoting the words of the Finance Minister—'additional expenditure under other heads of the estimates.'"

"THE MILITARY DESPOTISM WHICH PREVAILS IN INDIA."

The same note is to be found in all quarters of the Indian press. The blots to which the *Indu-Prakash* directs attention receive universal notice, and the reader is left with a profound sense of the monotonous, despairing cry which educated India raises in vain against the policy of her bureaucratic rulers. We may conclude with two further extracts upon the vital question of military expenditure. "The Chitral expedition," writes the *Bengalee*,

"was estimated to cost only 15 lakhs of rupees. It has cost, as now appears from the Financial Statement, a crore and 75 lakhs of rupees. Is it so very unlikely that we may have another expedition like the one for which we had to pay a little bill of nearly 2 crores of rupees? It is difficult to anticipate what may or may not happen on the frontiers. Expeditions beyond the frontiers represent the normal order of things. As the Government has to provide for its ordinary Civil and Military establishment, it may in the same manner set apart a certain sum of money—a million or two—on the expenditure side for our ever-recurring frontier expeditions. What will become of the small surplus balance of 50 lakhs of rupees, if there is to be another Chitral expedition? What will become of this surplus balance, if there is to be a sudden and unexpected fall in the exchange? The surplus will then be converted into a deficit, and another year of deficit will be added to the long category of such years. As in previous years, so also now, military charges loom largely on the view. They absorb our revenues, impoverish our people, demoralize our Government and accentuate the military despotism which prevails in India, and which, if English rule is to be permanent, must be replaced by a more popular form of Government.

"THIS LAMENTABLE WASTE OF MONEY."

Similarly the *Hindu* points out that the Chitral expedition has, of course, cost a great deal more than the Government at first anticipated, or were willing to avow to the public:—

"In the Budget of last year Sir James Westland provided the ridiculously small amount of Rx. 150,000, and had the vain hope that the preparations that were being made might not eventuate in war. But not only did war actually happen, but it has cost much more than Lord Elgin and his Councillors had at first an idea of. The expedition cost Rx. 67,200 in the accounts of 1894-95, Rx. 1,647,500 in the Revised Estimate of 1895-96, besides a further sum of Rx. 20,000 which will come under payment in 1896-97, making a total of Rx. 1,734,700 in India, besides a sterling expenditure in replacement of stores of £16,000. This is the cost of the expedition; but the permanent occupation 'has left us a legacy of permanent expenditure' which amounted in 1895-96 to Rx. 102,200, and which will involve in 1896-97 an expenditure of Rx. 231,700. Sir James Westland did not give us all the particulars of the expenditure already incurred, or of the annual expenditure in future years. But the figures given show that for the luxury of watching the internecine civil struggle of barbarous chieftains the taxpayers of India have had to pay for the expedition nearly two crores of rupees, besides a number of lives lost and the amount of suffering inflicted, and will have, in addition, to pay so much as 25 lakhs of rupees every year in future. It is impossible that the Government of India in this country or in England can justify to posterity this lamentable waste of money at a time when the public finances were in a state of the acutest crisis."

We only hope that members of Parliament and others will pay heed to these warning voices, which were never more urgently needed than now to correct the optimism of the India Office and the Government of India.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MAY, 1896.

REACTIONARY ENTERPRISES—AND AFTER.

IT is an ominous fact that the Government of India is exhibiting a disposition to introduce measures of a reactionary character which, even though they be regarded in the most favourable light, must produce a *maximum* amount of irritation with the possibility of securing a *minimum* amount of good. The recent Bill, now greatly modified, for the Amendment of the Legal Practitioners Act, furnished an instructive example of this unfortunate tendency. If the object of the Bill was to suppress "touting" altogether, the Government was undertaking a hopeless task. No legislation will succeed in removing an evil which requires remedies of a totally different nature. Respectable members of the Bar—and they are probably the majority—are unanimous in condemning "touts" as well as those members of their own profession who, deliberately or through carelessness, make it possible for "touts" to obtain a living. Perhaps the honest legal practitioner is a greater sufferer from the iniquitous system of *dalali* than the suitor who falls into the "tout's" clutches. The honest pleader is deprived of work which would otherwise have fallen to his share. The suitor, no doubt, sometimes falls through sheer ignorance a victim to the harpies who infest the Courts, but just as often with his eyes open he entrusts himself and his case to a person who, as he knows, has no legal *status*, with the sole purpose of saving expense. To protect even such suitors against persons who, are not scrupulous in their dealings is no doubt a praiseworthy act, and such provisions of the Bill as had this object were accepted without demur by the legal profession in India, and by the public at large. But there was no justification for another provision in the Bill which would practically have degraded and punished the honest practitioner for the misdeeds of the offending "hanger-on." The law as it now stands is probably stringent enough against the erring pleader. If he be convicted of giving brokerage or commission to a "tout," he can be sentenced to a term of six months' imprisonment, apart from the disciplinary punishment of having his name struck off the rolls. In Western countries misconduct on the part of an attorney or solicitor is rarely visited with such condign punishment. Perhaps it is this fact which influences the Judges of the High Courts, who have never yet, in a single case, imprisoned an offending pleader. What then were the purposes for which the Government of India recently attempted to lower the *status* of legal practitioners by making them answerable to district judges and commissioners for alleged acts of misconduct? Hitherto, though legal practitioners might be temporarily suspended by the district judges, the High Courts alone were empowered to adjudicate on their cases and inflict punishment on them.

There are two purposes which underlie the Government's reactionary measure, though they found no place in the statement of objects and reasons which accompanied the Bill. In a large number of cases pleaders had been suspended by district judges and reported to the High Court as unfit to practice at the Bar, but in all except a few instances the High Courts refused to accept the recommendations of the district judges, and either acquitted the pleaders or inflicted a nominal punishment on them. The proposed measure was, therefore, directed in some sort against the judges of the High Court, with the object of diminishing their power and transferring it to the subordinate courts. In the first instance, it is true, the Calcutta High Court acquiesced in the proposed change. But after mature reflection it changed its views, and, through its Registrar, wrote the following letter to the Government of India:—

"As regards Sections 2 and 4 of the Bill, I am to say that on further consideration, and having regard to the stringent character of the proposed legislation, the judges have decided to withdraw for the present the recommendation contained in their previous letter, that Sec. 14 of the Act should be so amended as to enable the district or sessions judges, or chief controlling revenue authority to whom the proceedings of subordinate courts are to be submitted, to suspend or dismiss the pleader or *mukhtar*, subject to an appeal to the High Court. They think that the provisions inserted in the Bill in accordance with that recommendation should be abandoned, and that no change should be made in the existing law in this respect."

The other purpose which may on good grounds be assigned to the measure arose from the fact that pleaders and *mukhtars* show a degree of independence which is not always relished by the executive authorities. Not only do they freely criticise the Government in their public utterances, and lead public opinion in agitating for reforms which are unpalatable to the Government, but in municipalities and district boards they cannot be easily

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

controlled by the district magistrates, and sometimes prove troublesome when the executive authorities are desirous of pushing through a reactionary measure. It would, of course, have been an easy solution of this difficulty to place the men who dared to think for themselves under the control of district judges and commissioners, who might have made short work of troublesome individuals.

That such a retrograde measure should have provoked a storm of indignation and given rise to criticism which was as unfavourable as it was unanimous is not to be wondered at. The objections raised against it were as varied as they were unanswerable, and may be summarised as follows :—

(*a*) The Bill, in its original form, would have lowered the position of legal practitioners, and, by degrading them, have aggravated the evils which it was intended to remove. The Government of India professed to be actuated by a desire to elevate the position of pleaders and *mukhtars*. It would surely have been a very curious way of attaining this end, to degrade them in the estimation of others.

(*b*) It was not necessary to subject pleaders to the proposed indignity in order to suppress "touting." No reasonable person could object to the punishment of "touts," and of legal practitioners who encourage "touting." But how depriving the members of the Bar of their privilege of being tried by the High Court would have tended to put down "touting," no one ventured to explain.

(*c*) It is most desirable in the interests of justice that legal practioners should fearlessly discharge their duties. In the Mofussil, where there is an utter absence of public opinion, and judges and magistrates are disposed unduly to assert their position, this is not an easy task. To have made pleaders subservient to district judges and commissioners would have been a heavy blow to the administration of justice. Could it be expected that a legal practitioner under the proposed law would be able as freely to cross-examine witnesses, or as fully and fairly to argue a case in which the judge had formed an opinion against his client, when he knew that the same judge might humiliate or punish him for any alleged misconduct? Knowing what we do of human nature we may reasonably conclude what line of conduct the pleader or *mukhtar* would have been likely to adopt.

(*d*) The proposed clause not only struck a blow at the legal practitioner, but at the public generally. If passed it would have deprived suitors in the Mofussil Courts of the privilege of engaging men who would fearlessly and honestly discharge their duties, and who would have in view solely the interests of their clients.

(*e*) Experience has shown that in something like 75 per cent. of the cases, the High Courts have disagreed with the district judges in the reports they have sent up against legal practitioners. The new Bill proposed, therefore, to place these men at the mercy of the judges who had been found unequal to the task of weighing the evidence or appreciating the gravity of an offence alleged to have been committed. That some of these judges had so failed is not surprising, for though some of them are men of ripe judgment and experience, others have been transferred to the Bench from the executive service and cannot show more than seven or eight years' service altogether. It often happens that such judges carry their executive bias with them, or from want of experience commit serious mistakes. The Government scarcely displayed a great degree of statemanship when it proposed to transfer jurisdiction in a class of difficult and often intricate cases from the High Courts to subordinate and less experienced Courts. It is, therefore, with extreme satisfaction that the public learned that some of the most objectionable clauses in the Bill were to be withdrawn at the instance of the Select Committee appointed to report upon it, and that the Bill would be thoroughly recast. Sir Alexander Miller, speaking in the Legislative Council on March 12th, said: "When I presented this report a week ago I stated that the Select Committee had made very extensive alterations in the Bill as originally presented—alterations which really amounted to a recasting of the Bill." And even the *Englishman*, on March 18th, commenting on the measure in its new and revised form, wrote :

> "It is admitted that grave abuses prevail, but not grave enough to justify the introduction of a system which would in many cases result in depriving ignorant litigants of professional assistance altogether, while it would only reach the evil of touting on those comparatively rare occasions when the tout proved more a fool than a rogue. The original proposals gave ample opportunities for the gratification of personal animosity, seeing that the practice of a pleader was made to depend upon the individual discretion of the officer presiding over a local court. A single delator might persuade the judge of the guilt of any practitioner, who would forthwith find his occupation gone."

The recent attempts at reactionary legislation have thus proved abortive. But they teach us, nevertheless, more than one lesson. They seem to disclose a certain disposition on the part of the executive authorities in India to pay scant regard (we use no harsher phrase) to the privileges of the people. With the avowed intention of improving the administration of justice they proposed a measure which involved the pratical abolition of trial by jury, and with the avowed intention of raising the *status* of the Bar, they proposed a measure which would have degraded legal practitioners and made them subservient to the official classes. It is most necessary, therefore, that we should be on our guard for the future and carefully weigh the effects of any legislation which may be proposed by the Government of India. Another inference from recent events is that the Government has begun to recognise the existence of public opinion in India, and the expediency of sometimes giving way to it. It was in this spirit that it surrendered the objectionable clauses in the Jury Bill and in the Legal Practitioners Bill. If with a united voice the people of India declare their opinions, and calmly and persistently press their claim to be heard, it will be a difficult task for the Government to ignore them. It is, moreover, by no means an unsatisfactory feature of these attempts of the Government of India at reactionary legislation that they have caused non-official Europeans in India to make common cause with the Indians. Sir Griffith Evans, who is understood to be in high favour with the Government of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India, was a member of the Select Committee in the case of both measures, and in both cases took the popular view. With reference to the cotton duties it was noticed with satisfaction that Europeans and Indians combined together to protest against the action of the Government of India. May we not hope that non-official Europeans are beginning to see that it would often be more to their advantage to make common cause with the people of India for the promotion of the common welfare of all?

POLITICAL SCIENCE.[1]

THERE is a story of a thrifty labouring man who, as the fruit of his savings, gradually acquired a homestead of his own with a garden, and afterwards a field and a pond, and ducks to inhabit the pond. Then, as his savings still accumulated, he invested pounds not a few in a steamship company. But after a short period of prosperity and handsome dividends there came a day when the company paid nothing to its shareholders, perhaps even made a call upon them. He returned home from the half-yearly meeting dejected and morose. When he took up his gun and slouched out of the house without saying a word, his wife's fears were aroused. She followed him, and found him standing by the pond, taking aim at the ducks and killing them one by one. It was in vain that she tried to dissuade him. "You let me alone, Jemima Jane," he answered her stubbornly. "I'm sick of it all. *No "more floating property for me!*"

To append a moral to a story is to go some way towards spoiling it. But as it would hardly have been permissible to tell the story here without some ulterior purpose, the reader will pardon the moral for the sake of the story, and, after a sufficient interval, proceed to the grave consideration of the moral itself. More morals than one are possible. The ethical philosopher might point out, if he were an utilitarian, the futility of the revenge; if an altruist, the injustice to the ducks. But our concern is rather with the standpoint of the logician, who would show that the labourer was led into his useless act of destruction by a false analogy, or by making a faulty classification based on unessential resemblances. The object of Political Science is to save us from similar errors in a higher sphere, where they are less ludicrous but more common and equally disastrous. For many of the current classifications on which men base their judgments in history and politics have little more to recommend them than the superficial classification which condemned the ducks to an untimely end because they belonged, like the unprofitable steamers, to the unlucky category of "floating property." When we divide states into monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies; when we follow the ancients in contrasting the government of the one and the government of the many; when we sharply distinguish the unitary state from the federation; when, lastly, we exalt the state that enjoys "liberty" and bemoan the state that lacks it—are we sure, in all these cases, that we know exactly what we mean or that we are expressing a really important distinction? "Realise "your ideas," one of the best of Oxford teachers, the late Mr. R. L. Nettleship, was never weary of repeating. It would be difficult to name a maxim more useful whether in philosophy, in literary criticism, in history or in politics. What a mass of pretentious writing in all these subjects dwindles away the moment the simple test is applied! "Realise your ideas; bring your abstracts to con-"cretes; define your terms." The student who wishes to be helped to carry out this golden rule of all clear thinking for himself could hardly have better guidance than is afforded by the two courses of lectures on Political Science delivered at Cambridge in 1885-6 by the late Professor Seeley, and now published by Messrs. Macmillan in their Eversley series. What Professor Seeley called "the con-"fusion of thought in which we cheerfully and "good-naturedly live" is well illustrated by our careless use of "that blessed word" (as the old lady reverently said of the word "Mesopotamia" in her Bible)—"that blessed word," *Liberty*. Originally it was not a political term, expressing a relation between the citizen and the Government, but a legal term, expressing the *status* of the citizen as compared with others who were non-citizens. The *status* of the slave does not exist in modern Europe, and so "our liberty is a metaphor "which has been, as it were, cut adrift; it expresses "a resemblance, an analogy, which we can never test, "because the phenomenon to which it points is entirely "unknown to us" (p. 110). In his sixth lecture, Professor Seeley distinguishes three different senses in which the word "liberty" is popularly used. First, as when we say the Greeks fought for "liberty" at Marathon, it stands for national independence. Secondly, in the classical stories of tyrannicide, and in the history of the English constitutional struggles of the seventeenth century, it stands for responsibility of government. Thirdly—and this is a use seldom distinguished from the second, yet needing to be kept quite distinct—it stands for a limitation of the province of government. In this third sense, which Professor Seeley regards as the most useful in political science, liberty is a good or a bad thing according to circumstances. Complete liberty would mean utter anarchy; but as nations have often suffered from an excess of government, liberty in the sense of restricted government (apart from the attractive associations of the other uses of the word) seems to us desirable. Yet it is important for the historical student to understand "the relativeness of "political truth" (p. 137). Professor Seeley does not shrink from the paradox that even religious intolerance "was, in its own time and place, not "absolutely condemnable": toleration, introduced prematurely into ground not prepared to receive it, would have acted as a solvent to the state to which it was applied. Nor must nations and governments be looked at without regard to their foreign environment; the pressure of external enemies is often the justification of repressive measures within. "The old restrictive legislation seems to be com-

[1] "Introduction to Political Science. Two Series of Lectures. By Sir J. R. Seeley, K.C.M.G., Litt.D. LL.D. Macmillan and Co. 1896.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"monly assumed to have been always utterly inde-
"fensible. This kind of dogmatism in politics I do
"not understand" (p. 136).

Another word that has been "soiled by all ignoble "use" is *Aristocracy*. It means properly, of course, "the government of the best," and is expressly contrasted by Aristotle with "oligarchy" as existing for the good of the governed and for no narrow and selfish ends; but partly because it constantly tends to degenerate into oligarchy, partly because oligarchy persistently usurps its name, it shares the ill-repute that is due only to its perverted form. So sadly has the word declined from its first noble meaning that we hear in America of "a shoddy aristocracy," "a "petroleum aristocracy," and the like.

It is nearly three centuries since Bacon's *Novum Organum* did so much to emancipate natural science from the fetters of Aristotelian traditions. Political science has not obtained, and did not altogether need, the same emancipation. Plato and Aristotle are still, and will probably long remain, "the first of "those who know" in this subject. Whom of the moderns shall we set beside them? Not Comte nor Buckle, certainly, nor Herbert Spencer, nor Professor Seeley. But accumulated experience has supplied us with many data for our science that the ancients did not possess. They had in view the intense but narrow political life of the small city-state. We, in our politics, have in view the large modern country-state; in our broad outlook over history, many forms of state, primitive and civilized, European, American, Asiatic. Of what use are the old Greek divisions of states into monarchies and republics, into aristocracies and democracies, to the student of Hindu society or Hindu history? We need for our modern studies new categories, such as those which Professor Seeley suggests—"states organic, states in-"organic; tribal states, theocratic states, states "proper; city-states, country-states centralised or "decentralised; federations strong or weak; states "where government has a large province, states "where it has a small one; states which have a "government-making organ, states which have not; "states where the power of government is in one "hand, states where it is distributed."

Such a classification of states as is here roughly sketched is eminently suggestive and stimulating, and it is freed from any obscurity that may possibly cling to it by the brilliant concluding lecture. In this the history of the world is rapidly reviewed with the object of showing how the categories may be applied. All the lectures are full of the high seriousness with which Sir John Seeley regarded history and politics and the duties of his own professorship. The concluding page speaks of the lectures, in the claim they make for political science as the proper function of the historian, as "seed "cast upon the waters." The seed is not wasted. The historian is not likely to go back from the province claimed for him. The view of history that Professor Seeley inculcated with so much genius will not be forgotten, though his earnestness may have led him unduly to disparage the function of the narrator, the singer of the prose epic of a nation's story. To make the past live again on the printed page, or to enshrine, as unscientific Livy did, the spirit of a people in deathless words—this is something more than prosecuting "an insignificant "branch of literature." But the prophets are too apt to call each other "lying voices." Let us hear from each his own message.

INTELLECTUAL INDIA.[1]

It is but a short time since we had the pleasure of commenting favourably on the first two volumes of Mr. Bose's patriotic and useful work. The present volume continues the story with no less ability and fairness of judgment than were displayed in its predecessors. The subject is large and complicated, but Mr. Bose selects his main points with much discrimination, and disentangles the threads of influence with patience and address. His object on this occasion is to indicate the nature and operation of the influences that have affected the Hindu intellect under British rule. His next volume will prove a still stronger test of his powers, for in it he proposes to develop the present incidental sketch of the moulding influences of the modern literature of India into a fairly complete account of the existing intellectual condition of the Hindus as reflected in literature.

Mr. Bose opens his third volume with a luminous general introduction, summing up the substance of the facts he marshals and the conclusions he draws from them. His first chapter is preliminary—a rapid sketch of the history of the Hindu intellect from the earliest times down to the commencement of the British rule. In the Vedic period he finds the Indo-Aryans in all the simplicity, the vigour, and the credulity of adolescence: this is the Age of Belief. In the Buddhist-Hindu period—the Age of Reason—he finds them exhibiting the robustness and the philosophical spirit of matured manhood. The Puranic period shows them in the decay and decrepitude of old age. This is the somewhat dangerous commonplace of comparison of the life of a community with the life of an individual; but Mr. Bose refrains from driving it too far. The decadence he traces to two main causes: first, the caste system, which, while it promoted spirituality and quietism, checked industrialism and combativeness, and rendered impossible the continued development of the civilisation based upon it; and secondly, the Muhammadan conquest which swept away the kingly patronage of the Brahmans. "The downfall of the Kings meant the ruin of the learned Brahmans whom they patronised; and the ruin of the learned Brahmans meant the ruin of Hindu literature and Hindu science, just as the overthrow of the Kshatriza Rajputs meant the destruction of Hindu independence." At the same time, "it was chiefly the influence of Muhammadanism with its

[1] "A History of Hindu Civilisation during British Rule." By Pramatha Nath Bose, B.Sc. (Lond.), F.G.S., M.R.A.S., Author of "The Centenary Review of the Researches of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Natural Sciences." In four volumes. Vol. III.: Intellectual Condition. (Calcutta: W. Newman and Co. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, and Co.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

doctrine of the brotherhood of man that produced that succession of earnest reformers who shed such lustre on India from the commencement of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth;" and while the Muhammadan conquest hastened the decay of the Sanskrit literature, it gave a decided impulse to the development of the vernacular literature, and it tended to elevate the lower classes, and to promote revolt against the inequality of the caste-system.

The doctrine of equality, though as old as Buddhism, had not sufficient vitality to be a motive factor in the progress of Indian society till it came under the anti-caste influence of British contact. Mr. Bose outlines the influences of British liberalism on India, giving special prominence to the spread of education, with its political, religious, social, and literary results.

"The sense of individuality fostered by the English environment has been a fruitful source of important changes. In religion, it first created a somewhat chaotic confusion, but later on led to rationalistic Hinduism; in social polity, it has diminished the stringency of caste rules. But its effect upon literature has been far more remarkable than upon religion or society. The Hindu cannot break through his social bonds without exposing himself to penalties which cannot always be regarded lightly. But there are no such restrictions upon independence of thought in literature. Educated Hindus who hold aloof from reforms which would subject them to the penalties of excommunication have no hesitation to exhibit their individuality in literature. Vernacular literature has made rapid strides towards progress within the last fifty years; and that this progress is attributable to English influence is inferable from the fact that the progress is greatest where English education has spread most, and least where it is most backward. Purely vernacular or purely Sanskrit education has done little for the improvement of vernacular literature . . . . The most eminent writers in vernacular literature within the last fifty years have all been English-educated men."

Mr. Bose recognises that the emancipated Indian intellect has been producing not only valuable and healthy results, but also much that is worthless, and even mischievous; but he sees that such an evil is unavoidable under modern conditions of progress, and that its day will gradually pass. He also acknowledges that the renaissance is "marked rather by extent of surface than by depth." The same criticism applies but too widely in the West as well as in the East, but still "there can be no denying the fact that proportionately a great many more works of abiding interest appear in the West than in India." The transitional state through which the Hindus are at present passing must be held to account for much, and to justify a prolonged suspension of severe judgment. The material conditions of the country also handicap the people very seriously in the work of intellectual development.

Turning to the influence of English industrialism, Mr. Bose points out that the immediate effect of it on India was "to reduce the artisan class to the condition of agricultural labourers, at least to a very great extent"—a step backward in the intellectual movement of the Indian community. The English mills and factories, however, served as models, and during the past quarter of a century "many new industries, conducted entirely by Indian agency on modern methods, have been started by the Hindus." Technical education, as we saw before, has made a beginning, though a small one. Still, it is something by no means inconsiderable to have got the ideas planted. "The aversion of the upper classes from industrial occupations is gradually disappearing. Members of the highest caste are beginning to engage in industries such as tanning, oil-pressing, soap-making, etc., which have hitherto been confined to the lowest castes." The advantages of a cheap standard of living and of local knowledge are, however, "more than counterbalanced by the disadvantages of want of capital and want of mechanical and scientific knowledge." In dealing with the railways, Mr. Bose most properly points out, "they do not indicate the progress of India in any way whatever."

"The fate of Indian art is doomed. The demand for it is daily decreasing, and will continue to decrease as the price of labour rises. In these days of cheap imitation things, genuine art productions requiring a vast amount of labour are not likely to hold their own. It is the larger industries involving scientific methods and appliances, such as cotton manufactures, iron-smelting, paper-making, etc., which are most likely to develop the resources of the country and make it rich, and which are, therefore, specially needed. There is also considerable scope for the application of the methods and results of modern science in agriculture. The skilled labour needed for the manufacturing and agricultural industries which are dependent more or less upon science is of various grades. The training required for the operatives would manifestly be best given in primary schools. But for teachers of such schools, chemists and others under whose direction large industries, manufacturing and agricultural, are carried on, a superior degree of scientific training is required, which may be called higher technical education. Besides the engineering colleges in the different provinces, and the chemical and physical laboratories of the medical colleges, and of such institutions as the Presidency College of Calcutta and the Elphinstone College of Bombay, there are but few institutions where higher technical education is now imparted in India."

The teaching of natural science has only in very recent years found favour in the eyes of the Indian educational authorities. The obstacles in the way of its progress are somewhat serious, but they are likely to diminish with collateral progress. There are but few openings for successful students, Europeans being almost always preferred. The allegation of native incapacity is a handy excuse, whatever may be the solidity of the grounds for making it. And here, again, "the extreme poverty of the people" stands in the way. Still, a beginning has been made, and time runs in favour of gradual developments. Mr. Bose reviews the progress of education generally—first English and then vernacular—and he devotes a special chapter to the education of women. The omens are all favourable, though the actual results are not yet to boast of; and the details he gives are interesting and instructive.

Perhaps the weightiest chapter of the book is the one dealing with the influence of the administrative policy of British rule. This topic touches the very heart of the whole question. The British peace is, of course, on the side of progress, but its influence is sadly marred by "the exclusive and unsympathetic policy" of the governing race. We, for our part, have always been insistent on the grievous consequences of such exclusiveness and lack of sympathy—consequences material and moral. Mr. Bose goes over the too familiar ground, firmly but without bitterness, and he concludes that the tendency of our policy has been to keep down the material condition of India at a level lower than that of the

CC-0 Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

poorest and most backward country in Europe; to suppress the natural aspirations of the flower of Hindu manhood; and to foster in them habits of thought and traits of character which are detrimental to sound progress." The indictment is a heavy one, and, unhappily, it can be fully sustained. Mr. Bose acknowledges our good intentions. But, after all, "it is lamentable to think," as Sir George Cornewall Lewis wrote half a century ago, "how little good has hitherto resulted to the people of India from the acts of a Government which has of late years been, perhaps, the most benevolent which ever existed in any country."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee, at its meeting on April 21st, elected four members of its Working Committee in the room of Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. W. S. B. Maclaren, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. A. Webb. The four new members are Dr. G. B. Clark, Sir John Leng, Mr. C. P. Scott, and Mr. A. R. Souttar.

Dr. G. B. Clark, who represents Caithness-shire, is a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and is personally known in India, whence he returned only a few weeks ago. He is a doctor of medicine, and is said to devote almost as much time to politics as to patients. Educated at the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh, and at King's College, London, he was for some years Consul-General in London for the South African Republic. He knows all about the Boers, and would probably have been President Kruger's host if that cautious statesman had accepted Mr. Chamberlain's invitation and come to London. Dr. Clark is one of the militant Radical members of the House of Commons. His popularity in Caithness may be measured by the fact that at the last three General Elections his majority has been, roughly, about three times as large as his opponent's poll. Lord George Hamilton has already had a taste of Dr. Clark's quality in the Jhalawar business, and will, no doubt, hear from him again.

Sir John Leng, who also visited India last cold weather, is one of the few Englishmen who have made fortunes on the other side of the Tweed and represent Scottish constituencies in the House of Commons. He is the second son of the late Adam Leng of Hull, and brother of Sir William C. Leng of Sheffield. Born in 1828 and educated at Hull Grammar School he became, at the age of nineteen, sub-editor of the *Hull Advertiser* and, four years later, editor and managing proprietor of the *Dundee Advertiser*, which, with the *People's Journal*, is a tower of strength in Liberal Scotland. Sir John Leng, who has written "America in 1876," is thoroughly in sympathy with popular demands whether in Dundee or in British India. His ripe experience, sound judgment, and far-reaching influence will stand the Indian Reform party in good stead. He enters thoroughly into the spirit of the protests which the poorest classes of Indian consumers make against Lord George Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties.

Mr. Charles Prestwich Scott, the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, is by common consent one of the most brilliant members of the House of Commons. It would not be easy to overstate the advantages which may accrue to the Indian reform movement from his active co-operation. Some twenty-five years ago, as an undergraduate at Corpus, Mr. Scott obtained a first in "Greats." A few years later he became editor of the newspaper which probably exercises more influence upon public opinion in the North of England than any other single force. Amateurs of the "new" journalism are sometimes heard to say that the *Guardian* is academic. The same critics would probably deny that "provincialism" is centred in London. When the Chitral question was being discussed the *Guardian* was, among morning journals, the strongest and most persistent opponent of the "forward" policy.

In the spring of 1891 a little knot of Oxford men were waiting in the new schools for the class list in the B.C.L. examination. When the clerk of the schools produced the list he called attention, privately, to one name among the "firsts"—the name of a non-collegiate student who had gone up to Oxford at the age of forty, or thereabouts, and had already secured a first in Jurisprudence. Four years later Mr. A. Robinson Souttar was elected member for Dumfriesshire, having in the meantime unsuccessfully contested the city of Oxford in opposition to Sir George Chesney. Mr. Souttar is not only a lawyer, but also a civil engineer and an Aberdonian. He has spent many years in India and knows the country and the people well, as Lord Ripon, among others, is able to testify. The working committee of the Indian Parliamentary Committee could not have found a worthier colleague.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee will shortly submit to Lord George Hamilton a Memorial in favour of the exemption, alike from excise and import duty, of all cotton cloths which do not contain any yarn of higher count than twenties. The Committee will, we understand, support their recommendation on the grounds that the suggested remission of tax upon coarser cloth will give relief to the extent of 10½ lakhs to the poorest classes, already depressed by a 4,000 per cent. duty on the salt they consume (viz., 2 rs. 8 annas per maund on what costs only 1 anna to produce); and that the recent imposition of 10½ lakhs of taxation upon coarser cloth is especially open to objection because the rest of the re-arrangement involved the remission of 37 lakhs (or, if the duty on fine yarns be added, 51 lakhs) of taxation, hitherto paid by the less needy classes.

The Committee will also point out that, while the the sole original ground for imposing excise duty was to prevent the import duty from operating protectively, the 3½ per cent. excise recently imposed on coarse cloth operates protectively in a high degree, inasmuch as Bombay and Manchester together supply at most two-fifths of the Indian consumption of such cloth, while three-fifths are produced by mills in Native States and by hand looms throughout India. Lord G. Hamilton will be reminded that the new excise duty distinctly encourages British

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

subjects to start new mills in Native States, and so deprive the population of British India of employment which they would otherwise have obtained from the further development of this industry. Attention will also be called to the fact that in many parts of India definite attempts are being made to organise a boycott of English cloth, and that as the ground of preaching this boycott is alleged injustice to India by the Government in favour of Lancashire, such a movement is undesirable, if not actually dangerous, from a political point of view.

As an indication of the feelings which have been excited by Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties, we print the following communication from an Ahmednagar correspondent:—"By this time you must have learned how indignant India is at the insulting treatment that it has received from the British Cabinet in the matter of the cotton duties. It is, perhaps, the first instance in the history of the world in which, for the good wishes of a few individuals, the feelings and opinions of three hundred millions have been insulted and mocked. If the Indian members of Legislative Councils have any sense of duty, they will resign their seats upon bodies for which Acts are manufactured in England. The mass of the people are doing their duty. Meetings in all the principal towns of India have been held, protesting against the new legislation, and resolving not to buy Lancashire cloth till this injustice is removed. I was never for Protection. I am a Free-trader. But I feel insulted at the attitude of the India Office towards Indian public opinion. The new Acts mean nothing else than that Manchester people would compel us to buy their goods. If I am a man, I will not be compelled. Till now I have worn English cloth. I will not wear it hereafter, because I cannot see my people slighted. Every true son of India ought to feel as I do. If he is proud of his ancient civilization, if he is proud of Muhammadan or Aryan descent, if he is proud of his Moghul, Rajput, or Maratha ancestor, if he is a man, he ought to repulse this rule by Lancashire. We must once for all open the eyes of blinded Lancashire and, through them, the eyes of all England to the fact that the true way of developing English trade is not to put obstacles in the way of Indian trade but to develop it. Ahmednagar has already achieved a great success. The cloth merchants here have ordered and obtained a large stock of Indian cloth. The leaders have set an example and the people are following it. To save our country from certain ruin England must see the results of its suicidal policy, and she can only see them through Lancashire. Let us, therefore, burn—the common remedy of the *Hakim*—Lancashire and ourselves too, if necessary, to bring the British Parliament to its senses."

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure continues its sittings at the Indian Office with closed doors. A rumour was current some time ago to the effect that Lord Welby and his colleagues would probably relax this rule, and admit representatives of the Press. It is hard to see why such strict secrecy is observed.

The "Quetta Directory," 1896 (E. B. Golwala and Co., Quetta), has probably served the purpose which its compiler had in view when the first edition was issued in 1890. There then existed an "impenetrable haziness" respecting Baluchistan, geographically, historically, and socially. It is not the fault of Messrs. Golwala if the gloom has not, to some extent, been dispelled. The seventh edition of the directory contains information on a large variety of subjects, from a history of the country to a tariff of prices for the hire of hackney carriages in Quetta. It is a "Kelly," a "Whitaker," and a "Baedeker" at the same time. We are given a directory of European residents in Quetta, with a full list of British Civil and Military (especially Military) Establishments in the country. Quite a third of the volume is devoted to laws and regulations in force, orders passed, and the rules made under them by the Supreme and the Local Governments. A chapter on frontier railways contains some valuable information, and the Indian taxpayer will observe with mixed feelings the statement that the total cost of 417 miles of frontier railway is 993 lakhs. A descriptive account of the principal buildings in Quetta is intended to serve as a guide-book to the tourist, who may recognise civilisation in the form of several churches and a brewery.

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE.[1]

By DINSHA EDULJI WACHA.

In the matter of military expenditure I have been for a long time a sort of wandering minstrel on more than one platform. If Sir James Westland says that exchange, and exchange alone, is the burthen of his song, I must acknowledge that military expenditure, and that expenditure alone, has been the theme of my minstrelsy from year to year during the last ten years. But the songster who sang so lustily of exchange is now hushed, not only in India, but in England. Expert opinion in England is now in accord with our own, that the growth of military expenditure is a more potent cause of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country than the much-abused and blameless exchange. The parable originally given currency to by the Bombay Presidency Association, though jeered at in the Supreme Legislative Council, was soon taken up by the British Committee of the Congress, and vigorously supported twice within the last twelve months by Sir Auckland Colvin, the ex-Finance Minister at whose feet Sir James Westland had sat and taken many a lesson in Indian finance. It was echoed by Sir David Barbour, another able Finance Minister, and the immediate successor of Sir Auckland. As if these two Indian

[1] This article consists of the principal portions of the Address delivered by Mr. Wacha at the Indian National Congress, last December, in support of the third resolution, which was as follows:—"That this Congress again records its firm conviction that, in view of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country, the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the army services and other military expenditure, home charges and the cost of civil administration, and it notices with satisfaction that expert opinion in England has now come over to the view of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, that growth in military expenditure is a more potent cause of Indian financial embarrassment than the condition of exchange."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

expert authorities were not enough, there arose Mr. A. J. Wilson, an expert well known in English financial circles, to demonstrate with even greater force and freshness the utter fallacy of Sir James Westland's assertion. The burden of the refrain did not end with him. It was soon taken up by two journals of the highest economic repute, the *Statist* and the *Economist*. The Congress has now been fully vindicated in its assertion regarding the appalling growth of military expenditure as the source of all our financial woes since 1885. Every word annually said from the Congress platform on the subject, from the date of the birth of the Congress at Bombay, has been verified.

Sir James Westland, in his Budget speech in 1893, admitted that between 1885 and 1888 the military expenditure predominated, and that it embarrassed the finances. But he asserted that since 1888-89 exchange had been the only cause of disturbance in the finances of the country. Here are his words:—

"My argument was that that increase (namely, increase in military expenditure) had been met by the fiscal steps we had recourse to in 1888, and that the necessities that arose since 1888 were due to exchange, and exchange alone. It did not arise, therefore, in immediate connexion with the discussion of our present position."

This statement, coupled with another made by General Sir Henry Brackenbury, that during the last few years the real growth in the army services has been only 4½ lakhs, the remaining 57½ lakhs being entirely owing to exchange, has greatly surprised me. Sir H. Brackenbury observed:—

"Between 1885-86 and 1893-94 there has been a rise of 62 lakhs of rupees in military budget estimates, but of this 62 lakhs, 57½ were due to fall in exchange—the actual increase in all these years, apart from exchange, was 4,50,000 rupees."

I have failed to discover the slightest confirmation of these figures. The statements of both officials seem to have been made without due investigation. From the following short table which I have prepared of the details of army expenditure from 1888-89—the figures being all taken from the annual blue, or rather yellow, books on the finance and revenue accounts of the Government of India—I find that neither Sir J. Westland's nor Sir H. Brackenbury's statements can be borne out.

DETAILS OF NET ARMY CHARGES—1887-88 COMPARED WITH 1893-94.

(*Finance and Revenue Accounts.*)

HEADS.	IN INDIA.			IN ENGLAND.			EXCHANGE.		
	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Increase or Decrease. Lakhs.	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Increase or Decrease. Lakhs.	1887-8. In Lakhs.	1893-4. In Lakhs.	Increase or Decrease. Lakhs.
EFFECTIVE SERVICES.									
1. Army and Garrison Staff	51·41	59·72	1·31	..	..	..	..	..	..
2. Administrative ,, ...	19·10	20·08	0·98	..	..	..	..	..	..
3. Regimental Pay, etc.	715·87	787·76	71·89	92·48	107·04	14·56	38·86	69·56	30·70
4. Commissariat, ,, ...	319·33	295·90	—23·43	3·73	3·08	—0·65	1·56	2·00	0·44
5. Remounted ,, ...	21·66	28·58	6·92	0·95	..	—0·95	0·39	..	—0·39
6. Clothing ,, ...	10·60	16·68	6·08	24·69	19·17	—5·52	10·37	12·46	2·09
7. Barracks ,, ...	22·88	22·75	—0·13	..	..	..	..	..	..
8. Martial Law	2·38	4·08	1·70	..	..	..	..	..	..
9. Medical	62·82	68·05	5·23	5·14	3·19	—1·95	2·16	2·07	—0·09
10. Ordnance	39·02	73·99	34·97	32·55	54·86	22·31	13·67	3·56	—10·11
11. Ecclesiastical	3·07	2·84	—0·23	..	..	..	..	..	..
12. Education	3·60	4·66	1·06	..	..	..	..	..	..
13. Sea Transport	4 20	5·74	1·54	20·34	25·00	4·66	8·54	16·24	7·70
14. Miscellaneous	38·55	31·22	—7·33	0·72	0·43	—0·29	0·30	0·28	—0·02
15. Volunteers	10·72	17·74	7·02	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total Effective ..	1325·21	1432·79	107·58	180·69	212·77	32·17	75·85	106·17	30·32
NON-EFFECTIVE SERVICES.									
16. Rewards	0·79	1·06	0·27	..	..	..	..	..	..
17. European Pensions	9·96	11·55	1·59	181·48	215·51	34·03	76·26	140·05	73·79
18. Native ,, ...	64·87	72·57	7·70	..	..	..	..	..	..
19. Widows ,, ...	—2·05	—4·75	—2·70	7·82	8·49	0·67	3·28	5·51	2·23
Total Non-Effective ..	73·57	80·43	6·86	189 30	224·00	34·70	79·54	145·56	66·02
Grand Total ..	1398·78	1513·22	114·44	369·90	436·77	66·87	155·39	251·73	96·34

Now, according to the two official authorities I have named, the expenditure proper on the army services would show no material growth, but exchange would exhibit a growth of 57½ lakhs. As a matter of fact the former is considerable and exceeds the latter to a large extent. I may mention that all my figures have reference to *net* charges—that is to say, gross expenditure *minus* the receipts under each head. The total effective services in 1887-88 in India cost 13·25 crores. In 1893-94 they rose to 14·33 crores or a net growth of 1.08 crores. The charges in England under the same head between 1887-88 and 1893-94 stood at 1·80 and 2·13 crores respectively, that is to say, they showed a net growth of 33 lakhs. The total net growth was, therefore, equal to 1·41 crores. What was the burden of exchange on the effective services during the same period? In 1887-88, when the average rate for the year was

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

16·37d. per Rupee, and the expenditure in England amounted to 1·80 crores, it amounted to 78·85 lakhs. In 1893-94, with the rate at 14·54d. per Rupee, it came to 106·17 lakhs. The increase equalled 30·32 lakhs. In other words, the actual army effective charges were 1·71 crores more, exclusive of exchange, in 1893-94 compared with 1887-88. These figures contradict Sir James Westland's and Sir Henry Brackenbury's statements. But this is not the whole tale regarding the growth of military expenditure. The non-effective service charges, which almost wholly consist of pensions to Native and European armies, have to be considered also. In India, these stood at 73·57 lakhs in 1887-88. In 1893-94, they amounted to 80·43 or a growth of 6 86 lakhs. In England, they rose from 189·30 to 224 lakhs equivalent to a growth of 34·70 lakhs. The total growth was 41·56 lakhs. Exchange in reference to these charges rose from 79·54 to 145·56 lakhs or an increase of 66·02 lakhs. The combined charges for effective and non-effective services and exchange may now be summarised as under:—

	Crores.	Total.
Effective Charges ....Growth=	1·41	
Non-Effective Charges do. =	0·42	
	——	1·83 Crores.
	Lakhs.	
Exchange Charges, Effective .....Growth=	30 32	
Do. Non-Effective do. =	66·02	
	——	0·96 ,,
		2·79 ,,

It is clear, therefore, that, despite the difference of 1·88d. per Rupee, owing to the fall in the value of silver measured by gold, between 1887-88 and 1893-94, the actual military expenditure was nearly twice as much as the charges of exchange on the same.

Let me show the growth of some of the principal items of expenditure. Take, for instance, item 3 of the table, namely, Regimental pay and allowances. In India, these rose from 7·16 crores in 1887-88 to 7·88 crores in 1893-94. The increase was equal to 72 lakhs. In England it rose during the same period from 92·48 lakhs to 1·07 crores, or an increase of 14·52 lakhs—say, in all, a growth of 86·52 lakhs, apart from 31 lakhs under this head for exchange. The evidence collected by the Fawcett Committee (1871-74), as far as military expenditure went, showed that India was being burdened with a larger expenditure owing to the exigencies of organisation, equipment, pay, and so forth of the Indian army, with which the British army has been amalgamated since 1859, in spite of the warnings and protests of those military friends who knew how oppressive an impost that amalgamation would prove. Every change in clothing, in arms, in ammunition and what not brings an additional burden on India, apart from the increase in the soldier's pay. In arms and ammunition especially, since the days of the frontier fireworks, which have already cost us 15 crores in 10 years, there have gone on incessant changes. No sooner is a gun or a rifle of a particular patent or inventor supplied to the army than a new weapon is substituted in the old, and the expenditure incurred soon becomes so much of a dead loss, which in the end, of course, comes out of the pocket of the Indian taxpayers. This is the result of the fatal scheme of army amalgamation. I lay at its door all India's financial embarrassments regarding military finance, next to the aggressive policy on the frontiers. Poor India is made a joint partner with rich England, with no voice in the regulation of her army expenditure. The War Office has only to order, and the helpless Government of India has simply to obey it. There is no "if" or "but"—such is the iniquity and tyrannical character of this unfair partnership. Every change in the English army causes a corresponding change here, whether in the matter of the soldier's pay and allowances, his clothing, his arms, his food, and so on, or in the matter of mobilisation. But to India the cost is well-nigh double and treble that of England. The lower the exchange, the outlay, especially on ordnance, and the increased amounts of the soldier's pay and pensions, inflict an intolerable burden on the treasury. This is one of the most crying of financial injustices, against which both the Government and the public at large, and the Congress especially, have hitherto inveighed in vain. Let us hope that the Royal Commission may recommend a relief which may be considered just by India, though I am not sanguine that any such relief may be expected from that official body.

Exchange has been proved to be a bugbear. In the first place, its burden has not been so embarrassing as the Finance Minister has endeavoured to make out. And in the second place, it should never be forgotten that during the last few years the amount itself of sterling remittances has increased by a million. In brief, while civil and military expenditure has increased 6·25 crores of rupees in seven years, exchange has only increased 4 25 crores. To quote the language of the British Committee:

"In other words for every rupee of additional burden entailed by the fall in exchange, the services add another rupee and a-half on their own account. . . . . The Government of India have not been content with a moderate increase of expenditure, but have continued, in reckless disregard of the capacities of Indian revenue, to increase expenditure in the civil and military services (however useful and desirable that expenditure may be) at a rate which under all circumstances is absolutely unjustifiable."

It only remains for us to appeal to the Government to curtail this overgrown expenditure in the civil and military services. As to the military charges Sir Auckland Colvin in his second contribution to the pages of the *Nineteenth Century* for October last observed that he does not look forward to any curtailment of them. He says:

"Of the three causes to which increase of net expenditure during the last ten years is mainly due, to one only, and to the only one to which it is beyond the power of man to control, can we look for any relief. So far as the two other causes of the increase of net expenditure be within the control of the authorities, whether in India or in England, it is clear now that no reduction can be looked for; neither in the army charges, nor in the net charges for State guaranteed or aided railways, will any diminution be conceded. We must look to exchange alone for assistance."

Then, there is every probability of the military authorities bringing the European forces to the requisite strength in proportion to the existing

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

native army, inclusive of the Imperial Service Corps and the irregular frontier levies. The probability is indeed of a portentous character. An additional 10,000 European soldiers would cost about 2 crores of rupees. Imagine the burden! When we are all striving our best to prove conclusively how burdensome has been the existing army expenditure, besides being the principal cause of the financial embarrassments which during the last few years have led to the additional taxation of 7 crores apart from the benevolence exacted from the Provincial Governments and the encroachments on the Famine Insurance Fund, here we are threatened with a large additional expenditure. But if there is to be no curtailment at the best in military expenditure, how are they going to ease the exchequer? Sir Auckland Colvin thinks we must look to exchange alone. Is it possible that from such a disturbing factor there could be any sensible permanent relief to the finances, and therefore to the taxpayer? One of the soundest canons of public finance is that a State should rely only on permanent sources of revenue and regulate its expenditure on factors which may not be of a fluctuating or uncertain character. But here we are recommended to rely on a most uncertain factor like exchange, the rise or fall of a penny in which makes the difference of over a crore. If there is to be a substantial reduction it would only be in the permanent establishments which have overgrown, and nowhere else. I have pointed out how far civil and military expenditure has increased during the last few years. It follows that any hope of curtailment must be found there and there alone.

THE COST OF SOLVENCY TO INDIA.

From "THE TIMES."

The text of Sir James Westland's Budget has now reached England. It confirms the views which we had already formed of it from the full telegrams published in the *Times* three weeks ago. But a minute scrutiny gives additional prominence to two features of the past year's finance. Sir James Westland's Budget is to some extent a budget of windfalls, we had almost said of surprises. There was, first of all, the unexpected rise in exchange, which practically dominated the situation. There were also a number of minor augmentations on both sides, such as the Chitral expedition to the debit of the Government and the salt tax to its credit in Madras. The second fact disclosed by a careful examination of the budget is that the Indian revenues are being levied with greater exactitude all round. Of late years there has not only been increased taxation, but the previously existing taxes have been made to yield larger amounts. We should be very happy if we could ascribe this expansion altogether to the natural development of Indian resources. But an analysis of the items renders so pleasing an explanation mere optimism. Sir James Westland has achieved solvency for Indian finance, yet in spite of the good gifts of fortune, which he is the first to acknowledge, that solvency has only been achieved by continuous and heavy additions to the burdens of the people.

In this respect Sir James Westland inherits the results of his predecessors' labours. During the past ten years, from 1886 onwards, it is estimated that new taxation to the extent of just under sixty millions of rupees has been imposed on India. The account is not a simple one, and certain items may have to be entered on the other side. But it has been made up with considerable care by Mr. A. K. Connell, whose statement stands thus. Between the years 1884 and 1889 a period of recurring deficits aggregating fifty millions of rupees took place. This had to be met by increased taxation, and after another period of deficits, in 1892 to 1894, the specified new taxes imposed on India during the last ten years make up a total of Rs. 59,829,000.

We have said that a statement of this sort is open to criticism on both sides of the account. Not less open to comment is Mr. Connell's statement of the expansion of the previously existing revenues during the same period. For that expansion is due in some measure to the increasing population, and to railway or irrigation extensions, and not to a severer pressure upon the people. Mr. Connell shows that during eleven years a sum of over sixty millions of rupees has been added to the Indian revenues by the expansion of pre existing taxes, while another sixty millions of new taxes have been imposed during the same period. But even this enormous increment has only produced a working surplus after reducing the famine grant by five million rupees in a year of threatened famine, and with the help of an unexpected, perhaps a temporary, rise in the exchange.

Such, according to Mr. Connell, has been the cost of solvency to India. If we turn from his elaborate calculations to the severer columns of the Abstract presented by the Secretary of State to Parliament, we find that the annual revenue of India increased from 706 million rupees in 1884-85 to 905 million in 1893-94, a total increment of close on 200 million rupees during the ten years with which the last Parliamentary Abstract deals—with a still further increase since then. It is an enormous expansion of revenue for an Asiatic country to bear. Here, again, we must avoid the danger of generalities. For during the ten years Upper Burma was added to the Indian Empire, and an increase of ninety million rupees has taken place in the receipts from railways, canals, and other productive works. But the Parliamentary Return shows an increase of 102 million rupees under the two headings of "Land Revenue" and "Taxes" alone during the ten years. Whether we take the accounts as made up by Mr. Connell to last year, or to 1894 as presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State, the ten years show an addition to Indian taxation which must make all who wish well to our rule in India pause before they congratulate themselves on the result.

Some of the extra taxation is of a character which severely presses upon the people. The salt tax, according to Mr. Connell, was augmented by eighteen million of rupees between 1884-85 and 1893 94. Sir James Westland's Budget shows a still further increase, making a total addition of about twenty-three million rupees levied on a necessity of life between 1884-85 and 1895-96. This increase arises

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

partly from an increase in the population, partly from their power of purchasing larger quantities of salt, partly from a windfall, and partly from a more uniform levy of the tax throughout India. But after making full allowance for these sources of increment, there has been a serious addition to the burdens of the poor; and we are again forced to realize the cost of solvency to the Indian people. In the same way the land revenue has been increased by thirty-seven million of rupees from 1884-85 to 1893-94, and by forty-three million rupees if we carry down the account to the present year. This is largely due to the rise in prices, a rise owing in part to the opening up of India by means of railways and irrigation, but partly, it would now appear, to depreciation of the rupee. The cultivators get more rupees for their crops, the Government claims more rupees from the cultivators, and it pays away more rupees alike in salaries and in discharge of its interest on gold debts. But difficult as it may be to work out the equation, the net result to the Indian cultivator is that throughout many districts he feels he is paying more than he used to pay, and in some he finds an increasing difficulty in meeting the increased demand.

The form of taxation which presses least heavily on the people is the import duties. The poorest classes need not contribute to those duties at all, and as a matter of fact they contribute a mere trifle to them. But it is in regard to these very import duties, levied from the middle classes who have chiefly prospered under British rule, that the Indian Government finds itself restricted. It is allowed to raise the rent of the peasant for his land and to levy a severer impost on the poorest classes for their salt; but it is denied a free hand in regard to the taxation of the middle and upper classes by means of the import duties, which they are willing and able to pay.

If, therefore, solvency has been again attained for India, we should not forget what it has cost the Indian poor. In certain provinces that cost has been a heavy one. The statements repeatedly made on the authority of Mr. Alexander Rogers, a late member of the Governor of Bombay's Council, still remain unanswered, and were lately presented afresh to Parliament in the form of questions to the Secretary of State. As a whole they amount to a charge of fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency which in 1893-94 led to the issue of 209,517 notices for sale of property against land revenue defaulters and to 14,198 of the Government tenants being sold up. Lord George Hamilton stated that the Government in Madras had been instructed to report on the matter. Yet we cannot forget that several years have elapsed since the question was raised by Indian administrators of high standing, and that some years have also passed since the Government of Madras was directed to submit an explanation. It may be that the explanation will prove a sufficient one, but it should be rendered without further delay. When we work the percentages the totals take a less alarming form. Yet outstanding charges of this sort create an uneasiness as to what the progress of the Indian revenues really means to the people, and as to the measures by which Indian solvency has been attained.

THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

THE AMIR AND THE KAFIRS.

A BLUNDERING AGREEMENT.

THE "EXPERTS," SOME MORTALS, AND LORD G. HAMILTON.

We reproduce from the *Daily News* of April 20th, the following excellent account of the amazing error in the Durand agreement, upon which we comment in "Indiana." The Parliamentary questions which are mentioned will be found in our Parliamentary supplement.

There has been some puzzling news of late from the regions near Chitral, where we have been settling boundaries with the Amír. It was only in November, 1893, that Sir Mortimer Durand made an agreement with the Amír, which was published as recently as Friday last, that he was not to exercise interference in Swat, Bajaur, or Chitral, including the Arnawai or Bashgal Valley. Last November, when two years had hardly elapsed, we had news that the troops of the Amír have been making havoc in the Bashgal Valley, and cruelly treating the Kafirs, a curious and ancient people, in whom students of ethnology and readers of books of travel are keenly interested. It has been assumed that at the least the Amír or his generals had been guilty of an oversight, and that he would be called upon to restore some of the captured Kafirs to their homes. As recently as Thursday last questions were asked in Parliament on the subject. These questions clearly took it for granted that the Durand agreement had been violated, that the Government must take steps to secure the restitution of territory "improperly acquired, and such reparation as was now possible for the slaughter and enslavement of the many thousands of Kafirs in a district which was specially included within the British dominions."

A GEOGRAPHICAL MISTAKE.

The full significance of Lord George Hamilton's replies does not seem to have been realised; but the fact is this. We have no control of the Bashgal Valley at all; it is the Amír's, to do just what he pleases with, unless we can persuade him (or decide that it is desirable to coerce him) into friendly treatment of the Kafirs. The Durand agreement excludes from the Amír's influence what is called the "Arnawai *or* Bashgal Valley": but it turns out that there is no Arnawai *or* Bashgal Valley. The Arnawai is one river, and the Bashgal is another river. Their directions both lie north-west and sout-east in a line crossing the Chitral River, which is also known as the Kuna. If we had got the whole of this line, we should have interposed a barrier between Afghan and Chitral territory; and that has certainly been an object of British diplomacy for years. But clearly our diplomacy has blundered, and the Amír has got the better bargain. The Amír has said in effect, "You asked for the Arnawai river, and I supposed you meant the Arnawai. The Bashgal is another valley; that is, part of Kafiristan, and belongs to me." It was in the Durand agreement "that any

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

differences of detail such as those which will have to be considered hereafter by the officers appointed to demarcate the boundary line shall be settled in a friendly spirit, so as to remove for the future, as far as possible, all causes of doubt and misunderstanding between the two Governments." In this case the Amír has certainly got the benefit of the doubt. It is admitted that he has got the territory over which the Mehtars of Chitral have heretofore claimed rights and territory visited by Dr (now Sir George) Robertson, with the result, according to Sir Lepel Griffin, that the people there were encouraged to look for English protection. The following are the terms in which Lord George Hamilton announced our virtual surrender of the Bashgal Valley:

"When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai Valleys ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east and the Bashgal River from the west. The frontier was therefore revised, and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír of the Bashgal Valley, which is west of the Kunar River, and over which the Mahtars of Chitral have claimed rights. This included part of the country visited by Sir G. Robertson in 1890 and 1891."

THE AMIR'S BARGAIN.

The Parliamentary paper issued on Friday leaves members of Parliament and the public without one means of judging the exact extent of the concession made to the Amír, and of determining how far this concession was really made on a "difference of detail." The fourth clause of the agreement says that the object of the Frontier Commissioners should be to "arrive by mutual understanding at a boundary which shall adhere with the greatest possible exactness to the line shown in the map attached to this agreement, having due regard to the existing local rights of villages adjoining the frontier." Did not the map settle the question whether the Bashgal Valley was to be excluded from Afghanistan or not? The inference from Lord George Hamilton's answer and from the non-appearance of the map is that it did. No map accompanies the Parliamentary paper, and we are told in a footnote that the map is "not reproduced because the actual demarcation of the frontier under Clause 4 is not completed." But another proof that the line meant by the Indian Government must have been the Bashgal Valley, since handed over to the Amír, seems to be afforded by a map now before us with this note: "Compiled and drawn in the Intelligence Division, War Office, mainly from the latest Indian survey and Russian staff maps, under the direction of Lieut.-Col. J. C. Dalton, R.A., D.A.A.G., 1892. Revised April, 1893." Now, upon this official map we find the river on the Kafiristan side of the Kunar marked as the "Arnawai, or Bashgal River," but no trace of the river which Lord George Hamilton now tells us is the Arnawai on the Dir side of the Kunar. The communications between Kafiristan and Chitral are by this Bashgal Valley, which has been wrongly named the Arnawai. That it was not originally intended that he should have the control of these communications is settled by the references to the Amír and Chitral in the Chitral Blue-books. However, the answer of Lord George Hamilton proves that some one has blundered. This north-east slice of Kafiristan, like all the rest of it, is in consequence in the actual possession of the Amír; and the English lady-physician to Abdul Rahman is quite right in saying that he had acquired his freedom to subdue all Kafiristan by treaty with Great Britain.

THE KAFIR HEROES.

The great interest taken in the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush is partly inspired by a remarkable tradition of their heroic disregard of danger and their preference of death to surrender. It is very curious that the tradition has been repeated in the experience of last autumn, unless Dr. Lillias Hamilton has been deceived by a lying story based on the old tradition. We give the two stories one after the other.

"THE STORY OF 1866.

"In 1866 a fortified Kafir village, attacked on the side of Badakshan, seeing resistance hopeless, preferred a voluntary "suttee" to embracing Islam or becoming slaves to Muhammadans. The wounded Kafirs, emaciated by hunger, gave their last strength to gathering large beams, on which the women poured their last store of oil, and holding their children by the hand, entered the huge funeral pyre, where the invaders found them all burned to death."—Dr. G. W. Leitner, in the *Globe*.

"THE STORY OF 1895.

"The tribe called Sia Posh (black dress) engaged in a fierce fight with the Amír's troops at a place called Shespoos. They were all armed with good firearms, and commenced the battle in the open. The Afghans under Captain Mahomed Ali Khan, consisting of several battalions of well-trained men, besides Ghazis from Panjshir, Anderab and Lozman, made considerable havoc among the undisciplined Kafirs, who were forced to retire to their fortified villages, whence they continued to fire on the Afghans through holes in the walls. The tables were now turned; the Kafirs lost but few men, the Afghans many. So, contrary to the express orders of the Amír, who wished every one to be taken alive, the captain was obliged to make use of the heavy guns. In this way many of the houses were destroyed, and the Kafirs were obliged to fly for protection from one village to another, until finally they were completely routed. The Afghan soldiers then rushed into one of the villages to capture all the remainder alive, but some 400 or 500 of them set fire to their own buildings and perished in the flames, rather than fall into the hands of the enemy.—Dr. Lillias Hamilton, in letter dated Kabul, Feb. 19th, in *Times* of April 4th."

It is a curious fact that Dr. G. W. Leitner, from whom we have the story of 1866, finished it with the words: "History may repeat itself, and, unless we save Kafiristan, leave a blot on British honour such as no subsequent professions can efface."

Mr. H. C. Thomson, describing the mounted fastnesses of these Kafirs in his "Chitral Campaign," said of their country:—

"It is quite possible that Kafiristan, and not Chitral, may be found to be the key of the position. It is said to be quite inaccessible, and it it is known that Timur was obliged to leave it unconquered, after losing a great number of men in the attempt to subdue it. On the other hand it is asserted, with some show of reason, that Alexander the Great, starting from Balkh, came down through the western portion of Kafiristan to the Kunar river, near Jellalabad, so it is quite possible there may prove to be a practicable road through it, though the country through which Colonel Holditch passed was so steep and rugged that it took him seven hours a day to march eight miles."

We may quote as a sequel to this one further passage from Dr. Lillias Hamilton:—

"In the map brought by Captain Mahomed Ali Khan one place was marked Kali Timoor—the fort of Timoor—and he explained that on a stone there he had found the following words engraved: 'The Amír Timoor of the Mogul Dynasty conquered this country so far, but was unable to proceed

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

further.' The Amír's officer then went on to say that on that same stone he has engraved the following words from the Koran: 'The true faith in one God has overcome the infidels or believers in many gods.' Also the following inscription: 'In the year 1313 [*i.e.*, 1895], during the reign of the Wise King, Amír Abdurrahman Khan, the whole of Kafiristan was conquered and incorporated in the kingdom of Afghanistan.'"

The Amír was evidently of Mr. Thomson's opinion, for he defended his determination to have his authority acknowledged in Kafiristan on the plea that if he did not hold all the country with a strong hand, the Russians would soon be within two days' march of his capital. The Amír is, therefore, already master of all Kafiristan, and he owes his position in its north-eastern parts adjoining Chitral to a mistake in the interpretation of the Durand agreement.

The *Daily News* wrote on April 21st: As regards those Kafirs of the Hindu Kush there is a curious difference between the statement made in the House of Commons last night by Lord George Hamilton and that in the Reuter's telegram from Simla. The Secretary for India says the Amír has directed his officers to treat the Kafirs leniently, and not to convert them against their will. The direction would be amusing if this were a laughing matter. The Reuter version is that the Amír is treating "*submissive* Kafirs with extreme leniency, and has despatched strict orders to the Afghan officials not to oppress the Kafirs or seek to convert them to Islamism by force." There is not much in this to encourage the friends of the Kafirs. What satisfaction there is to be got out of the telegram lies in fact that the Amír seems to be impressed with the desirability of conciliating public opinion in this country. From the defence of his conduct in Kafiristan, which has been sent to this country by his lady physician, we know that he is aware of the interest taken in the Kafirs by men of light and leading here. If, as Lord George Hamilton says, the Amír has prohibited traffic in Kafir slaves, he has admitted, what his lady physician denied, that there has been such traffic. The House of Commons is informed that no opportunity has presented itself to the Viceroy to press the Amír on behalf of the Kafirs. We stated the reason yesterday in our article explaining the extraordinary blunder made in the Durand agreement. The Kafirs have been handed over to the Amír's tender mercies in consequence of the bungling of some one in India; and the Viceroy must feel Kafiristan to be for us a delicate and humiliating subject.

On April 23rd the *Daily News* added:—It is amusing to follow Lord George Hamilton's answers to questions about the Amír and the Kafirs. The House of Commons gets glimpses of the truth, but is not allowed to get the whole truth. How innocent was his answer yesterday afternoon! "After the Durand Convention was agreed to an enquiry took place, and in certain places it was found that the topographical features of the country did not quite correspond with the terms of the Convention." No; we should think it did not correspond, for what did he tell the House on Thursday last?

When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai rivers ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east and the Bashgal River from the west. The frontier was therefore revised, and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír, the Bashgal Valley, which is west of the Kunar River, and over which the Mehtars of Chitral have claimed rights.

This was the valley that the Durand agreement was intended to exclude from the influence of the Amír. As we explained on Monday, it was described in the agreement as the Arnawai *or* Bashgal River, in apparent ignorance of the fact that the Arnawai and Bashgal were different rivers, and not one and the same. But the agreement also defined the territory to be excluded from the influence of the Amír by the stipulation that the Commissioners who carried out the demarcation should "adhere with the greatest possible exactness to the line shown in the map attached to this agreement." Hence we asked whether the map did not make it clear that the Bashgal Valley was meant; and hence the interest attaching to that map, which has not been reproduced with the Chitral papers containing the Durand agreement. Lord George has no spare copies of the map. It is, and will remain, a rarity.

Reviews.

SKETCHES BY PAI.

Stray Sketches in Chakmapore. From the note-book of an idle citizen. By N. W. PAI, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, High Court. (Bombay).

When the last page has been turned, the last sentence ransacked for its concealed jest—for it very soon becomes painfully obvious to the reader that Mr. Pai is nothing if not a wag—the question that first arises in one's mind is, why "Sketches?" We have had "Sketches by Boz," Washington Irving's "Sketch-book," Thackeray's "Sketch-book," and numerous others. We have seen sketches by great artists which were regarded by connoisseurs as priceless. And in the case of more than one illustrator of modern times the sketch has been adopted as the neatest and most convenient form of expression. But the distinguishing feature which all great sketches, both in literature and art, possess, is the absence of the "sketchiness" which is the main characteristic of Mr. Pai's book. A sketch should, in order to have any value, artistic or literary, give a clear and connected impression of the outlines and definitive features of the subject chosen for treatment, omitting all unnecessary detail. Those artists who have attained any eminence in the presentation of their more permanent work in the form of sketches have done so by first carefully drawing in a complete study then carefully deleting everything superfluous. So the accidental omission of any essential point is guarded against. And when a sketch is taken simply as the basis of future and more elaborate work it becomes useful and valuable only in proportion as the genius of the artist enables him to seize at once on the important traits of his subject. What is true of art in this connection is equally true of literature, postulating only the necessity of literary and grammatical finish in the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

latter case as correctness of drawing is postulated in the former. It is true that the term sketch has been used in literature to include many a little picture as carefully elaborated as a miniature or as some of Meissonier's eight inch by six canvases, now worth about twenty-five pounds per square inch. But that is absolutely no reason for allowing the extension of the term in an opposite direction to include a tabulation, resembling in style the average auctioneer's catalogue, of details chosen more arbitrarily than are the objects selected for portrayal by the Röntgen rays, which at any rate show the skeleton form underlying the outer man, although they dignify his collar-stud and trousers-buttons with a permanence denied to his brain or heart. It is towards this limit that Mr. Pai strains the definition of the word "sketch." Imagine a Röntgen vacuum-tube which scorns skeletons and casts images of buttons, and you have an allegory of Mr. Pai's faculty of literary selection. Tommy Traddles, another lawyer of much leisure, spent his spare time in drawing marvellous skeletons of divers sorts, and we cannot help thinking that he was much better occupied than Mr. Pai.

The author pleads guilty to a double motive for the publication of this volume. The first is a desire to amuse the reader, the second is a hope of arousing his interest sufficiently to encourage him to study the types delineated in their native haunts. A third motive is suggested by the inscription at the foot of the title-page: "Published for the author by M. Kane and Co." If, as we anticipate, the reader is bored rather than amused, if his desire to study Indian life is not whetted by his perusal of these sketches, at any rate the author has enjoyed the pleasure of seeing himself in print. The preface promised a delineation of many out-of-the-way Indian characters; but from anything that we gather from the author's account of them, they might, with few exceptions, equally well be Europeans or Chinese in Indian costume with an Indian background, or we might even number many of them amongst our own English acquaintances. The only difficulty arises from the absence of individuality in the characters. They might easily be one man in many costumes. The author's poverty of ideas is remarkable. The first essay, on the cat, might have been written by any schoolboy of fifteen with the aid of a dictionary of synonyms, and the whole volume might have been written by the same schoolboy after six months' residence in India. The author's style is the style of a man who is perfectly familiar with all the ordinary simple forms of English, but instead of confining himself to the uses with which he is most conversant, he has bought a dictionary of synonyms and thumbed its pages assiduously in the spirit of craving for variety that animates the football reporter in the sporting journals. His wit belongs to that species which consists in substituting circumlocution for directness: to melt is to "deliquesce," thirst is "the bibulous powers," obliging is "humoursome," an old proverb becomes "the excellent maxim which places cleanliness next to the possession of an angelic disposition," sleep masquerades as "*somnus*," another trite saying appears thus, "a certain sable personage with wings and horns is supposed to find plenty of work of a questionable nature for those who have more leisure than they know what to do with" (why will Mr. Pai call himself "an idle citizen"?), going to the dogs is "going to the interesting quadrupeds of the canine species," an egg is described as "a white ellipsoid which, when fresh laid, is quite a *bon-bouche* (*sic*) for an epicure," as "an incohate duplicate of the hen and her proud lord," as "a little white pellet of dormant life." It will be noticed that Mr. Pai does not hesitate to sacrifice accuracy to variety at times. We pass over a number of minor errors which might in another case have been laid to the charge of the printer, but in this case could, on strong presumptive evidence, be attributed to the author, in order to cull a few flowers of grammar and rhetoric at random: "As a playmate for the children the temper of the cat is extremely uncertain. . . . . The sudden use of her paw produces long red marks of a painful character on the poor victim's delicate skin." "Himself assumes the roll of judge." "Put a stopper on the phials of their wrath." "A glorious sense of insecurity rather trying to the nerves." "If you think that the true *raison de etre* (*sic*) of cavalry is to look grand . . . . *cadit quaestio*."

Whenever Mr. Pai ventures to express an opinion on any topic of political or social interest he evidently inclines to the official view, though he has not taken much trouble to secure himself against the charge of inconsistency. He sympathises with the sahib who is forced to pay for brutality in his treatment of a servant, and blames the officiousness of the division bench which has sufficient sense of equity to advise the sufferer to seek further redress in a civil court. He has nothing but cold scorn for the zealot who strives for reform, but he is not too proud to patronise the National Congress in a superior manner as an assembly of coolies. He affects an interest in the rational treatment of convicted criminals, and shrinks with apparent horror from the contemplation of the terrible effect of exemplary sentences on the novice in crime. "He carries within him that wonderful something we call a human soul. The precious possibility of living down his sin and shame, of fighting the powers of evil within him, and of rising triumphant, is not hopelessly gone. Yet how terrible the struggle before him! If in the past, when society yet held him within its pale, he tripped, what chance is now left to the poor wretch to make a bold stand?" Such is the glib commonplace cant of the man who, three pages before, describes the notorious horrors of an Indian prison thus: "A residence is kindly provided for him in one of those delightful establishments which serve as temporary asylums for people in a delicate state of moral health . . . . With his experiences within the walls of the prison we have nothing to do. They cannot be over-pleasant, as is shown by the frequently large mortality. But of course he must not be too particular." Are we taking the author too seriously? *Fluctus in simpulo*, no doubt, as Mr. Pai would have said, had his book of Latin quotations contained that particular phrase. But what a vast proportion of the world's sufferings proceeds from errors of taste rather than mistakes in morals, and how much

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

less troublesome in actual life is the wrongdoer than the "mild Philistine," as Mr. Pai terms himself, though we might prefer to qualify the adjective. "There are some people who never seem quite happy unless they can make others uncomfortable. I am sure they mean well, but that does not reconcile me to their meddlesomeness. Why will they not let us alone? Why will they be always making horrible revelations" of Philistinism and vulgarity? Oh, Mr. Pai! *Mutato nomine, i e.*, with the addition of the last four words, *de te fabula narratur!* Nay, we doubt whether even so obscene a bird as the crow mentioned on page 100 of your volume could have brought himself to demand a place in your sketches.

SELF-CRITICISM.

Good Reading about Many Books, mostly by their Authors. Second year. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

Mr. Fisher Unwin, who is presumably responsible for this remarkable production (in fact, his position as head and forefront of the offending is typified by a wonderful design on the first page, which centres round a bust wherein we discern some resemblance to him), should really issue some directions to the authors of the various works which he desires to advertise. The fact of the material alteration of the aspect of the Glamorganshire coast-line by the fast falling or fast rising tide every few hours of the day is one the importance of which we do not desire to minimize. But its value as a recommendation of a book on Russian politics, even if we suppose that book to have been first suggested to the author in Glamorganshire, is distressingly small. We had just as lief read a treatise on the same subject inspired by the contemplation of the British Museum library. Similarly irrevelant pages make up quite half of the book under review. If no further instructions are given next year to the compilers of this annual, we would suggest that the title be altered by the omission of the word "good," which is not suitable to the present issue at any rate, and the substitution of "and" for "mostly by." Under the present circumstances, while we gather a vast deal of uninteresting and (rarely) interesting news about authors, there is very little to guide us in the choice of books from Mr. Fisher Unwin's catalogue. We learn that he numbers among his clients representatives of every grade of life, from a descendant (on the mother's side) of Caolbha, the one hundred and twenty-third and last monarch of the Irish race and forty-seventh king of Ulster, to a former *employé* of a German gentleman near Sydney, who, if he had worked, might have earned 7s. 6d. per rood for trenching and £3 per acre for clearing scrub; that Germany, France, Italy, Sweden, as well as all parts of the British Isles and British Empire, contribute to swell his list of publications; that amateur poetry, amateur psychology, amateur history, are alike welcome in Paternoster Square. Nay, more—you may study the portraits of the talented authors, as well as Mr. Joseph Pennell's conception of Mr. Fisher Unwin rising on eagle's wings across the stars. But not more than half-a-dozen of the contributors have had the wisdom to write an introduction to their own books. This is a pity; and the more so, because one or two of the sketches written for this purpose—we would instance Mr. George Jacob Holyoake's and Mr. Timothy Cole's—are really "good reading" Possibly the other authors could not, if they would, have done likewise. But they might, at any rate, have told us what they thought of their own work, and then we should have had some guide to its value. No man ever thought well of his best efforts. When Mr. Everard North frankly condemns his novel, we desire to read it; but when a poet is so filled with self-satisfaction as to write a poem for his own advertisement, we hesitate to buy his book—a hesitation justified, in the case of the two poets who have done this service for Mr. Fisher Unwin, by the extreme badness of the samples given to us.

India is fortunate in her representatives (leaving aside "Mimosa") in this volume. Mr. R. W. Frazer is one of the wise half-dozen, and in some six pages has told us, without once using the word "I," sufficient of the point of view from which he has approached the study of Indian mythology to show that in "Silent Gods and Sun-Steeped Lands" there has been an honest attempt to understand the religious position of the varied peoples of India without any misleading infusion of Western or modern ideas. Even more important is the translation of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's novel, "Krishna Kanta's Will." An English public which greedily devours the Anglo-Indian fiction of Rudyard Kipling is willing to remain solidly ignorant as to the native literary powers of the inhabitants of India. If it thinks at all of the educated classes of that country, it does so by taking as a basis of serious and solemn thought the caricatures of *Punch*. Therefore this translation is likely to prove of service. A nation which can produce a novelist whose works are equal in force and insight to those of the greatest English writers is one worth the attention of this self-centred public. And the circulation of novels of this class in England will perhaps bring home to the English people the fact that this India which they rule is not a stage provided by Nature for the employment of the surplus population of the Universities and the acquisition of untold military glory by a few favoured officers, but is a land full of human beings with lives and minds that must be regarded.

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder

IS

"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ABOUT THE BURMAN.

The Burman, His Life and Notions. By SHWAY YOE. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

This is the second edition of Shway Yoe's book on Burma, and it is practically identical with the first edition published in 1882. It possesses at least one advantage over many books of the same class—it is the work of a man thoroughly conversant with his subject, not a record of the first impressions, nor the extended diary, of a hasty visitor to the country. No attempt is made at a history of Burma, but there is an excellent description of the state of the country under the two last kings. Though the government may have been admirable in theory, in practice it would appear that a worse system could hardly have been devised. Each official, whether high or low, was subject to immediate disgrace if he incurred the displeasure of his superiors, and an amusing anecdote shows what was the prevailing opinion as to the treatment of unpopular officers:—

"When Mindohn Min heard that the elections had gone against the Ministry in 1874, and that Disraeli was to be Premier, he sighed and said, 'Then poor Go-la-sa-tong (Gladstone) is in prison I suppose. I am sorry for him, I don't think he was bad fellow.'"

Not only was the life and freedom of the official in jeopardy, but his salary depended upon the money he could raise for himself in the area for whose revenues he was responsible. Consequently, of course, the cultivators paid far more in taxes than ever reached the king's coffers. During the time of King Mindohn the country was further impoverished by the institution of monopolies, and these were only ostensibly removed by Theebaw when he ascended the throne. It is wonderful to read that the latter was, "on the whole, more popular than any king of Burma has been since the days of Alompra," for he was to all appearance an unscrupulous tyrant. Burma may gain something in wealth and development of trade by the introduction of a body of State-paid, and punctually paid, officials. At any rate the reason that Bishop Bigandet gave in 1880 for the comparative poverty of the Burmans—that if any one was suspected of being rich he became at once exposed to extortion, and even his life was endangered—should have ceased to operate. It is interesting to forecast the change that a settled Government is likely to produce in the character of the Burman. Will he always continue the happy-go-lucky person he is at present? Will his superfluous earnings always swell the wealth of the Pagodas or Madrasis? Or, will a Western Government bring a Western turn of mind and the Burman become as careful for to-morrow as any of us? It is undeniable that the rule under which he has lived has contributed to his present disposition in some measure, but natural tendency counts for something, and the extreme fertility of the country probably counts for more. The cultivation of paddy in the plains of Lower Burma involves the minimum of labour, and though too wet a season sometimes means the loss of a whole crop, it is then not too late to secure a second harvest, and there is always a market for the produce. There is another factor in the production of the Burman which should not be overlooked—his early education. While this continues to be given in the monasteries it is probable that the Burman will retain many of his present traits of character. And it does not seem likely that schools, so long-tried, and on the whole so excellent, will be readily superseded. At the present time we read that:

"The Government and vernacular schools have had very little effect in reducing the number of scholars who go daily to study in the dimly-lighted schoolrooms of the monastery. Not even in Rangoon have the monks to call for scholars; they flock there abundantly of their own accord."

It is in domestic rather than in business functions that the Burmese appear to advantage. Their good-temper and willingness to please and be pleased have no drawbacks there, and in the chapters which are devoted to accounts of the plays and festivals in which they delight we have an interesting glimpse of the picturesque simplicity in which the Burmese live.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1896.

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Prince Henry of Orleans, "From Yun-nan to British India."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Turkhud, M.A., "A Lecture on Kathiawar." Dhingra, B.L., "Medical Aid for Indian Women."

PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Gough, Lieut-Gen., Sir Hugh, "Bengal Cavalry."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1896.

HANEIN, E. H., M.A. ..... "Cholera in Indian Cantonments, and how to deal with it." (Deighton, Bell and Co., Cambridge)	3s. 6d.
REV. J. E. PADFIELD, B.D., Missionary C.M.S Masulipatam ..... "The Hindu at Home, being sketches of Hindu daily life." (Simpkin, Marshall. Madras, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge)	3s. 6d.
HANDBOOK OF INFORMATION FOR INDIAN STUDENTS, relating to University and professional studies, etc., in the United Kingdom, issued by the Committee of the National Indian Association. 8th edition. (Constable.)	1s. 6d.
LORD EGERTON OF TATTON ..... "A Description of Indian and Oriental Armour." With an Introductory Sketch of the Military History of India. New edition. (W. H. Allen and Co.)	— —
CLIVE CUTHBERTSON, Bengal Civil Service ..... "A Sketch of the Currency Question." (Effingham Wilson)	— —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.

[C.—8037.]—EAST INDIA (NORTH-WEST FRONTIER). —Correspondence relating to the Occupation of Chitral	0s. 3d.

Printed by A. RONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 6. (NEW SERIES.) JUNE, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	161
The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	166
Another Look at the Budget, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	167
The Moplahs and the Land Tax in India, by J. Dacosta	168
Frontiers and Finance, by an Independent Politician	170
Magistrates on Tour, by A. Nundy	172
India in the British Parliament	174
Our London Letter	175
The Predominant Partner	177
Lord G. Hamilton's Defence	179
State Landlordism in Madras	180
Money and the Movement of Prices	181
Indian Troops for the Sudan: Opinions of the Press	182
The Cotton Duties: Memorial to Lord G. Hamilton, etc.	186
Reviews: The Spoils of War	189
The Theosophy of the Vedas	190
The Hindu at Home	191
A Hindustani Grammar	192
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	192
Recent Official Publications	192

Indiana.

The Cotton Duties.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN moved the adjournment of the House of Commons on May 18th in order to call attention to the effects of Lord George Hamilton's recent rearrangement of the Indian cotton duties. The critics of the motion, which was virtually closured, contradict each other. Sir Henry Fowler, after a consultation with Lord George Hamilton behind the Speaker's chair, condemned it as premature and immature. The *Manchester Guardian*, on the other hand, declared that it was "quite out of date." Both cannot be right, but both may be wrong. The motion for adjournment, which Sir W. Wedderburn describes and discusses on another page, was the climax of a series of efforts directed against what public opinion in India regards as an inequitable and unnecessary piece of taxation. Sir Henry Fowler announced his willingness to discuss the question, and to defend his own policy, at the "proper time." But when will that occasion arise? Is it not Mr. Henley who sings, "In the streets of By-and-by, stands the hostelry of Never"? Under the provisions of the Indian Councils Act the Secretary of State for India is empowered to disallow measures which have received the assent of the Viceroy. The efforts of Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues of the Indian Parliamentary Committee sought first by private communications, then by memorial, and finally by a motion in the House of Commons, to secure the relief for which the people of India prayed. The motion would have been submitted a week earlier but for the congested condition of the debate on the Education Bill and the imminent publication of a Blue-book on the cotton duties. When it was submitted, Lord G. Hamilton had given his assent to the obnoxious measures. But it was still open to him to remit, by executive order, the duties to which exception was taken. Sir W. Wedderburn's proposal, which has been fully explained in our columns, is set forth in the Memorial addressed to Lord George Hamilton by the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Their contention, urged by all sections of opinion in India, official and non-official, Indian and Anglo-Indian, is that by the new Acts which the Government of India was compelled to accept last January, a wholly unnecessary tax is imposed upon the poorer class of consumers in India at a time when relief is given to the comparatively well-to do.

The Burdens of the Poor.

THE unanimity of opinion in India and the gravity of the indignation which has been aroused, will not be disputed by anybody acquainted with the facts. In February, 1895, when the cotton duties were about to be included in Sir J. Westland's tariff, Sir H. James moved the adjournment of the House in order to complain that the duties would result in Protection. The motion—immature and premature though it may have been—was not discouraged by Sir Henry Fowler, who defended his policy in language which

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a clerical admirer afterwards compared to Burke. Sir H. Fowler added that if Protection could be proved, he would take all possible steps to prevent it. The motion was defeated. But it cost many Lancashire Liberals their seats, especially as Lord George Hamilton, who had stigmatised the duties as unfair to Lancashire, re-asserted his opinion as Secretary of State on the eve of the General Election. Lancashire weavers and cotton-spinners were invited in the largest type and the most vehement tones to "Vote for the Unionists and the Repeal of the Cotton Duties." It remained for Lord George Hamilton to redeem his pledge. But, as the Indian Parliamentary Committee contend, he did far more. Reducing the duties from 5 to 3½ per cent., and extending the excise duties to all cotton cloths woven in Indian mills, he at once diminished the burden upon the comfortable classes, who wear the finer cloths previously subject to a 5 per cent. duty, and increased the burden upon the poorer classes, who wear the coarse cloths that were previously subject to no duty at all. It is easy to say that a "boycott" of Lancashire cottons is impracticable in India. That is not the point. The point is that the "boycott" has been advocated on what appear to the people of India to be reasonable grounds. Lord George Hamilton says that whatever agitation there was in India has died out. Violent agitation, upon which his argument seems to set a premium, may for the moment have subsided at the prospect of redress. But the sense of injustice remains and, as the best authorities agree in thinking, is not less but more dangerous for being driven inwards. Lord George Hamilton, whose courtesy was acknowledged by Sir W. Wedderburn on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, has not been in India, and therefore may not appreciate adequately the gravity of a widespread sense of injury at the hands of the Imperial Government. Sir John Leng has just returned from India, and he found everywhere signs of strong and bitter resentment.

The Magnanimity of Sir H. Fowler.

NOBODY, we imagine, who has observed the career of Sir Henry Fowler since he became Secretary of State for India was in the least degree surprised at his extraordinary conduct in attacking the motion and repudiating its authors. But in the case of any other man, holding a similar position, such conduct would have been strange. Lord George Hamilton has overthrown Sir H. Fowler's policy on the question of the cotton duties as he reversed his policy on the question of Chitral. But Sir H. Fowler, like Gallio, cares for none of these things. He is too magnanimous. When Sir W. Wedderburn and his friends denounced Lord G. Hamilton's policy in Chitral, and upheld the policy of his predecessor, Sir H. Fowler indicated his interest in the proceedings by leaving the House. When they criticised Lord G. Hamilton's re-arrangement of the cotton duties, Sir H. Fowler, who has not yet been Chancellor of the Exchequer, singled them out for vehement attack, although he had received specially early information as to their intentions, and, indeed, as to their proceedings from the first. These are, it is true, somewhat odd manifestations of Liberal principle. But, at any rate, Sir H. Fowler's zeal made it abundantly clear that the motion was not a party motion. The Indian Parliamentary Committee did its work admirably. It proved a thoroughly efficient instrument for securing an Indian discussion even at a time of exceptional pressure in the House of Commons. But the fact that, with the exception of the Front Bench, the whole Opposition rose to support Sir W. Wedderburn's motion might, but for Sir H. Fowler's speech, have given a party tinge to the incident, especially as not one of the supporters of the Government did anything to obtain or to strengthen the discussion. This apparent one-sidedness was the more curious as the ranks of the Ministerialists include, to say nothing of Mr. Bhownaggree, some distinguished Anglo-Indians who are known to sympathise with the complaints put forward by Sir W. Wedderburn. Mr. Bhownaggree went so far as to take notes of the discussion. But his courage stopped short of a speech. Yet the Indian Parliamentary Committee had left no stone unturned to secure the active co-operation of many of the Government's supporters. The incident will undoubtedly strengthen the common belief that Conservatives, when their party is in power, will not kick against the pricks. Liberal members interested in the welfare of India had many pitched battles with the late Liberal Government on Indian questions and, on the question of simultaneous examinations, defeated it. It looks as if it were easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a Conservative to act with independence.

Lord Welby's Commission.

THE Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure still cultivates secrecy in its deliberations at the India Office. The affectation of mystery is hard to understand and harder to justify. We ask again on what grounds the public and the Press are debarred from being present. Is public criticism feared? Are the facts of Indian expenditure and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom such that they cannot, with dignity and safety, be divulged? It is unfortunate that such questions should be encouraged, as they are, by the procedure adopted by Lord Welby and a majority of his colleagues. That publicity will be permanently avoided cannot be expected by the most sanguine obscurantist. The

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

evidence will, we presume, be published at some time. Or is it thought that its mere bulk, if it be presented to the public as a whole, will disarm all save official readers? Such a result, if it occurred, would be a great misfortune. The electors of the United Kingdom are, theoretically, responsible for the good government of India, but they are rarely reminded of their trust unless Indian troops are being borrowed to do Imperial work at the expense of India, or import duties—themselves a product and an indication of Indian financial embarrassments—are resented by Lancashire. If the proceedings before Lord Welby's Commission had been reported, however baldly, in the Press, many readers might at least have been reminded that there *is* an Indian question, and an inkling of its meaning might, without an undue strain upon their faculties, have been borne in upon them. But how many of them will sit down to sift the ponderous volumes which, two or three years hence, will give us the whole mass of the evidence in a lump? Besides, if we dare drop such a hint, some suggestions might, in the other case, have been forthcoming from the outside for the benefit of the Commission. It is not, however, too late for the Commission to mend its ways, and if it still refuses to extend its hospitality to the public, may we suggest that it should follow the example of the recently-appointed Commission on Liquor Licensing Laws, as to which the following announcement was made a few days ago:—

"The public will not be admitted to the meetings of the Royal Commission on Licensing, but the Press (except when private matters are discussed) will be represented."

There is another little act of thoughtfulness, also, which the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure seems to have overlooked. It is reported to have divided its subject-matter into sections. When the first section is complete, so far as the evidence is concerned, why should not that part of the evidence be issued in a single volume without delay?

Some Maxims from Lord Rosebery.

IT is often instructive to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to Indian affairs the words of wisdom which fall from the lips of British statesmen with reference to other subjects. Lord Rosebery, speaking in Devonshire on May 15th, repudiated the doctrine that "the great masses of the people of this country do not care much about foreign policy":—

"I venture to say that those who hold that doctrine are wrong, first, because foreign policy is a question of expenditure, and, secondly, because it is a question of honour. *Your policy and your expenditure are so closely allied that they are almost interchangeable terms, because your expenditure must depend largely upon your policy, and your policy must depend largely upon your expenditure.*"

Precisely. Yet Sir Henry Fowler, when he undertook to appoint a Commission to enquire into the administration and management of Indian expenditure, essayed to mark off questions of policy as forbidden, if not sacred, ground. "Your policy and your expenditure are so closely allied that they are almost interchangeable terms." Lord Welby's Commission has doubtless proved the truth of the proposition in spite of the warnings of Sir Henry Fowler—which, however, found no place in the terms of the reference. There was another passage in Lord Rosebery's speech to which the reform party in India will do well to pay attention. He was describing the battle which now lies before the Liberal party:—

"Let me tell you quite frankly that you have a stiff task before you. You have to fight three giants—three enemies in one. You have, in the first place, to fight the present Government—a giant with feet of clay, you may think, but a giant at any rate which exercises the almost unlimited power with which it was entrusted at the last election. But you have, in the next place, to fight not merely the Government, but the people who returned them to power. For some time after a general election such as the last, those who voted Tory, nay, those who abstained from voting Liberal, or from voting at all, will feel that they are in some degree participators in, in some degree responsible for, the action of the present Government. . . . . Well, you have a third enemy to fight against, and I am not sure that that is not the most formidable of all. You have got to fight the apathy of the country.—(Hear, hear.) It was from the apathy of the country that the last general election drew its chief results."

If this be said in the green tree, where one of the great parties in British politics is contending against the other, what must be said in the dry, where Indian reformers, destitute of votes, are endeavouring to enlist the sympathy of this "apathetic" country on the side of their legitimate but unfamiliar grievances? The lesson, it seems to us, is twofold. In the first place, the Congress leaders should see, as most of them do see, the need of patience. They should not be unduly cast down if the rate of progress seems to be dismally slow. But, in the second place, they should keep their powder dry and leave no stone unturned to "fight the apathy" of the United Kingdom.

The North Aberdeen Election.

THE retirement of Dr. W. A. Hunter from Parliament is a serious loss to the party of Indian reform who, on so many criticical occasions, were able to draw upon his wide knowledge, ripe experience and sound judgment. His absence from the House of Commons, and, still more, the cause of it, will be deeply regretted in India. If anything could have mitigated the loss, it would have been the election, as his successor, of so able and independent a politician, and so tried and true a friend of India, as Professor Murison. There was, we believed, good reason to anticipate that the choice of North Aberdeen would fall upon our distinguished contributor. He was defeated, not by the votes of the electors, but by the methods of a political caucus. He was too chivalrous

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to approach the Liberal executive until his friend Dr. Hunter had formally retired, and when, almost at the eleventh hour, he visited the constituency, the ground had been already salted. Those who know anything of North Aberdeen know perfectly well that, even so, Professor Murison would have been elected by a handsome majority if he had stood as an independent candidate. We have nothing to say of Captain Pirie, who nearly lost the seat, except that he was emphatically not the better man. On the morrow of the poll the attempts of the Liberal newspapers to explain the melting away of Dr. Hunter's tremendous majority, and the highly creditable performance of the Independent Labour party, were pathetic as well as ludicrous. The question which this election raises is, we do not hesitate to say, a vital question for the Liberal party. Anything more fatuous than the present practice—as distinguished from the theory—of selecting Liberal candidates in some constituencies, it is impossible to conceive.

India in the British Press.

NOTHING is more common in the letters which we receive from Indian correspondents than the complaint that the English press is, as regards Indian questions, "nobbled" by "the officials," and that only the official view is presented to the public. What is meant is not, we imagine, that English journalists are bribed—which would be an outrageous and grotesque calumny—but that through private influence, and the supply of information, the official clique secures undue favour at their hands. There is some truth in the complaint, though not, we think, so much as its authors imagine. It is not probable that many journals in the United Kingdom employ a leader-writer, to say nothing of a sub-editor, whose special subject is India. Indian questions, to put it bluntly, are not, or are not believed to be, "good business" for English newspapers. The result is that on the not very numerous occasions when Indian questions become prominent—as, for example, when the Indian Budget is laid before Parliament, when the cotton duties cause a stir, or when Indian troops are sent to Egypt—the leader-writer, who expresses opinion, and the sub-editor, who sets out news, have to do the best they can in a hurry. What is the result? The Blue-book supplies the one, and Reuter's telegrams, or the special telegrams to the *Times*, supply the other. Hence, unless the individual journalist happens in some way to have been brought into touch with independent Indian opinion, or an Indian question has become to some extent a party question in this country, official statements and opinions are more or less complacently reproduced. It is a matter, not of "nobbling," but of hurry, and of "the line of least resistance." There is a good deal of human nature in journalists. General complaints and regrets that this is the case are futile. What might be useful is an organised endeavour to supply English newspapers, in a convenient form, with the facts and the opinions on which educated Indians rely. This is a very different thing from sending over bundles of newspapers, unwieldy packages of memorials, undigested pamphlets, windy speeches, and discursive articles. The destination of these things is, and will remain, the waste-paper basket. But we believe that much might be done by the intelligent, regular, and prompt supply of concise and well-digested information. English journalists "in the lump" are, we are very sure, on the side of fair play. But they are human, they are very much occupied with questions that are not Indian, and they are often over-worked. It is idle to complain that they ignore independent Indian opinion unless steps are taken systematically to bring that opinion to their knowledge in a compact and convenient form. This can be, and therefore ought to be, done.

"Determined Optimism."

A CORRESPONDENT writes:—"When a special article in the *Times* can be reprinted in the columns of INDIA without unfavourable comments, there is some ground for the assumption that the Indian national cause is making headway in England. The value of this article, on the cost of solvency to India, is enhanced by the fact that it was not a mere haphazard effusion at variance with the general tone of the criticisms on Indian affairs appearing in the same columns. Rather it appears to have been the latest and most extreme development of the writer's interest in his subject. Would that the same felicitations could be extended to the editorial staff and the special correspondents of the *Times*! Unfortunately the conversion appears to be sporadic merely, for the foreign telegrams, the leading articles, the Parliamentary notes and reports still bear the stamp of official complacency and ignorance, and even the writer of 'Indian Affairs' has much prejudice to slough off before he can be regarded as a fair and impartial critic of his subject. Prince Alfonso of Portugal is blamed for the 'note of determined optimism' which marked his despatches in connexion with the Goan insurrection. Is there nothing of 'determined optimism' in the opinion that 'European Powers domiciled in the East must preserve their supremacy by a perfect civil and military organisation such as Great Britain alone seems able to maintain in Asia?' Is it, then, by force of arms that we hold, or can in the last resort hope to hold, our glorious Indian Empire? Pity rather than surprise fills the mind when one hears an intelligent supporter of the present Ministry soberly declare that 'if India

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

is ever so ungrateful as to forget the benefits conferred on her by English rule and revolt, the rebellion can be crushed again as it has been before.' After all, that is the popular view of the Indian mutiny. But what is to be thought of the mental attitude which admits a just conception of the terrible state of Indian finance, yet, while conceding the possibility of disturbances in the South Western districts, regards them as due, if they occur, merely to the bad example set by Portugese subjects; which permits the use of such expressions as 'our irresistible position in Asia'; and which 'recognises that it is only our overwhelming force in Asia which saves us from similar troubles on a far greater scale'? Is not this something like 'determined optimism'?

The Troops for the Sudan.

"IT is now two months since the suggestion was first made that an Indian force should occupy Suakin. The suggestion was welcomed, and its reception was made the occasion of a great deal of self-laudation by the organ which professes to lead English public opinion. It was allowed that English appreciation of the financial necessities of India and of the injustice involved in the present distribution of burdens left something to be desired. But it was confidently stated that in spite of our backward education in this respect we had still learned something considerable during the last thirty years—be it noted here that the 'forward' policy has during the last twenty years enjoyed its most remarkable degree of prosperity—and that when the Royal Commission on Indian finance published its report the education of the British electorate and their representatives would receive a further impetus. This at least was certain, that the iniquitous arrangement by which England borrowed Indian troops for her own purposes and charged the Indian Government for their pay could never recur, and must to the next generation of Englishmen appear incredible. Alas for the optimism we were encouraged to cherish! The Chancellor of the Exchequer stated on May 12th that, having regard to previous precedents, the ordinary expenditure of the Suakin troops would be charged upon India. What reception would be accorded to the proposal to borrow your neighbour's horse for several months' heavy work on condition that the said neighbour paid for the animal's corn? Such is the nature of the proposal which a blind and selfish adherence to a bad precedent induces the Government to lay before Parliament; which the Tory Ministry after unsuccessful attempts at evasion have only under strong pressure consented to discuss in a formal debate after the vacation; which, finally, seems likely to be treated as a fair subject for purely partizan strife and supported in violation of all considerations of justice by the rank and file of the Tory party, merely in order to prevent their political opponents from scoring even the semblance of a triumph. Consider, too, into what a position the obstinacy of the Government has brought them. If they carry their proposal they gain, in the sacred cause of party, a victory over the consciences of their supporters. If they fail to carry the proposal they suffer that most shameful of all defeats, a defeat in a wrong cause, and in a battle of their own provoking.

The Russian Spectre.

"WITH a Cabinet controlled by the Minister who is primarily responsible for the revival of the forward frontier policy in 1876, and with Lord George Hamilton at the India Office, he would indeed be a worthy successor to the immortal Mark Tapley who could view with equanimity the outlook in Asia. It is now stated that Russia is about to build a railway that will bring her within striking distance of Herat, and an alarm is raised. Russia acknowledges the project, pleads purely commercial motives, in which plea she is supported by so great an authority as Colonel Gerard, and assures us that her policy in Asia will be guided solely by the policy of Great Britain. If Russia acted up to the letter of such a declaration, the prospects of lasting peace in Asia would be indeed poor; for even the most ardent supporter of the forward policy will hardly claim that its tendency is pacific. It is openly admitted that the latest Russian move is probably due to the reports which have reached St. Petersburg as to the 'enormous stores and great preparations for advance at the end of the North-Western Railway of India.' No attempt is made to deny the existence of such stores and preparations, or to explain the purpose of them. Moreover, half a crore of rupees is to be set aside this year for mobilization. Everything seems to indicate a pursuance of the policy of aggression in an aggravated form. It is England not Russia who is taking the offensive. Russia, although her designs may not be so peaceful as she asserts, certainly maintains for the most part a defensive attitude, abandoning it only when it suits her policy in Manchuria and Corea to provoke British activity and fix British attention on the mountainous wastes of Afghanistan, and to secure freedom from jealous interference with her purposes on the Pacific Coast. To accuse her of designs on India by way of Afghanistan is to accuse her of mad folly. Yet, as Simla well knows, the accusation is almost certain to receive credit in England. While the forces that fight against progress are flourishing with such undiminished vigour it is worse than folly to turn our gaze backwards and contemplate what little has been achieved with anything approaching satisfaction."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

A PARLIAMENTARY PROTEST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

Strait is the gate and narrow is the way for any Member who desires to raise a debate in the House of Commons on an Indian grievance. He cannot bring it up on the British Estimates by moving a reduction of the Secretary of State's salary, because the Secretary of State for India is privileged to help himself from the Indian Treasury without a vote from the House of Commons. The Member who desires to appeal unto Cæsar has therefore only two alternatives remaining: to move the adjournment of the House; or wait for that dim and distant day, the "Indian Budget," on which, some time in August or September, the accumulated complaints, appeals, hopes, and aspirations of 250 millions of our fellow subjects are summarily disposed of by a few scattered members before a jaded and empty House.

If the matter is in his view emergent he must try to move the adjournment; and he at once finds himself surrounded by countless snares and pitfalls. He must in the first place satisfy the Speaker that the matter is not only of public importance, but also that it is "definite and urgent." As in the days of Lenthall, so now also, the Speaker has neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak but as the House is pleased to direct; the Speaker must represent the average feeling of the House, and from this point of view how many Indian grievances will be deemed of public importance? *A fortiori*, how many will be judged to be urgent when in competition with home questions of burning party interest? And having satisfied the Speaker on these points our Member must arrange for at least forty sympathisers to be present in the House at the right moment, and rise in their places to support his motion. Anyone acquainted with the ways of the House knows what a difficult task this is. Members are at all times liable to be called away for one reason or another, and with the best intention often fail to keep their appointments. A Government Whip responsible to prevent a count knows this well, and does not consider himself safe unless, in order to provide a House of forty members, he has got a promise from at least 100. For a private Member to make certain of these forty good men and true, is thus a source of continuing anxiety. And even if he is successful in these various proceedings, he may still be baffled by any single Member who chooses to put down a blocking motion; that is who gives notice of a resolution bearing on the same subject. If this is done, as was done on May 13th in the case of the Indian troops at Suakin, no one is allowed to move the adjournment to call attention to the same subject matter. Further, comes the danger of the closure which, as in the case of Chitral, may be applied at the very commencement of the proceedings. Also, you must stand up exactly at the right moment, which is after question time, immediately after the last question has been asked, or your opportunity may be gone for ever. Finally some technical point raised at the last moment, some small oversight in procedure, may wreck the frail bark even as it seems safely to be entering port.

Such being the dangers which beset the adventurous soul who contemplates moving the adjournment of the House, it must be admitted that we have on the whole been fortunate as regards the case of the Indian Cotton Duties. The precedent of Sir Henry James's motion in February of last year was a valuable one, and I was able to satisfy the Speaker that the grievance in question was definite and urgent, mainly by pointing out that it lay in the hands of the Secretary of State at once to remedy the evil which was arousing so much ill-feeling in India. Acting in his executive capacity he could, by a stroke of the pen, either disallow the obnoxious Acts altogether, or at least remit those duties which pressed upon the poorest class of consumers.

Accordingly the Speaker accepted the motion, and asked the House whether it would give leave to move the adjournment. And then the independent members who sit on the Liberal side came bravely to the front. The Indian Parliamentary Committee had done their work well. They came themselves, and brought their friends; so the striking spectacle was seen of the whole unofficial Opposition rising in a body, and amid hearty cheers leave was given; and poor India was allowed an opportunity vicariously to record a protest against the injustice which has been done to her. In this matter the thanks of India are especially due to the Irish Members who in full numbers gave their support, for they did so against their direct interest, which is at present to oppose any delay which may interfere with the early passing of the promised Irish Land Bill. Acknowledgments are also due to the Members connected with Lancashire, who put justice to India before any personal considerations.

The Government put on the closure when Mr. Souttar rose to support the motion. It is much to be regretted that the House was deprived of the opportunity of hearing a gentleman whose long residence in India in an independent position entitled him to speak with authority. Other independent Members, by rising, also showed their desire to challenge the official version of the case. But the discussion was cut short, and we had no opportunity for a reply. Under these circumstances, the debate having been thus maimed and rendered incomplete, there was no alternative for me but to withdraw the motion, with a view to bring up the matter again upon another occasion. Looking to the overwhelming majority of the Government, it was not possible to obtain any important concession. But it was always something in the right direction that Mr. Arthur Balfour, in consideration of the withdrawal, promised to do his best to bring on the Indian Budget at an early date. Sir H. Fowler stated that he was prepared to make his defence, and that the defence would be made at the proper time. It is desirable to know when that convenient season will come, and how he proposes to create the opportunity he contemplates. It is probable that he will be publicly questioned on this important point.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE BUDGET.

By PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

By grace of accident and the turning of the screw, the Indian Budget, as we have seen, has just succeeded in getting itself formally balanced. But it is only the purely official mind that can experience any solid satisfaction from the performance. The result is all but absolutely negative, and the dreary stone will have to be rolled up the rough hillside again next year with the same oppressive labour and vexation. None more than ourselves would rejoice to be able to congratulate Sir James Westland on a genuine surplus based on a natural expansion of the resources of the country—a healthy surplus bringing honest cheer to the hearts of the people. When shall that good time be?

Certainly not until Sir James's military colleagues shall be kept from thwarting his anxious endeavours with their foolish and futile enterprises. The pages of this magazine have displayed in the fullest detail the disastrous influence of military expenditure upon the Calcutta finances, and the utter hopelessness of their retrieval so long as that influence remains in the ascendant. There is no question at all that the army in India must be sufficient in strength and in equipment, and ready for any necessary service. So far one can agree with Sir Henry Brackenbury. But where lies the necessity for such enormous expenditure as has been going on for many years along the north-western frontier? During the past year alone, the Chitral expedition cost, according to Sir Henry Brackenbury, no less than 173½ lakhs. But for this drain, "the whole military expenditure would have been 79 lakhs below the estimates." Consider, then, the difference to the Budget if there had been no Chitral expedition; and the further difference in future Budgets if there were no continued occupation of the country. The question inevitably works round to the point of policy, and that, we take it, is absolutely beyond argument. It was no necessary service on which these 173½ lakhs were expended. The frontier is not a whit safer or less unfriendly than it would have been at the present moment if there had been no expedition whatever. The thing is the merest wantonness of military caprice. It is time that the Russian bugbear were summarily extruded from our imaginations. With the three great passes under English guns, we may sleep comfortably—even if Russia wants India. It is very certain that India, in spite of all our provocations, does not want Russia.

With regard to internal military needs, it is but cheap rhetoric to contrast, as Sir James Westland contrasted, the peace and security given to the country under British rule with the war and disturbance that previously reigned. The argument can easily miss the point, and it might readily be stretched to cover ten times as many lakhs as Sir Henry Brackenbury threw away on Chitral. Peace and security once established, can it be contended seriously that the present army, with all the expenditure it entails, is required for their permanent maintenance? Such a contention would be nothing short of ridiculous. The country would be absolutely peaceful and secure with the merest formality of an army, if it had but reasonable prosperity and were governed without gratuitous irritations. When the internal need of an army is in question, it is well to recall the attitude of the general population of India even during the very crisis of the Great Mutiny itself. But while it is obviously necessary that the army should be sufficient and effectively equipped, it does not follow that needless expense may not be incurred in keeping up with the newest inventions. The military secretary naturally desires to signalise his tenure of office by external signs of improved efficiency; he aims at breaking the record. This spirit, essentially good and not to be damped inconsiderately, still needs to be watched and controlled. The saving of 16½ lakhs a year on ammunition, clothing, and war material generally, points to an important means of evading the toll of exchange, and of stimulating internal industries. The pressure of necessity seems at length to be opening our official eyes to the probability of getting more golden eggs out of the goose by feeding the animal judiciously than by starving her outright. The more comfortable her condition, the less likely is she to be perverse.

Too many of Sir James Westland's arguments seem to betray an official compulsion of forgetfulness of the practical working of his finance operations. The immediate business of the Finance Minister is to balance his books, no doubt; but the essential business, after all, is to establish and maintain contentment among the people. In the face of the fiscal severities in the Madras Presidency—and these can be more or less paralleled in other parts of the country—what practical use is there in pointing out that the share in land assessments taken by the Government "has been steadily reduced during the last hundred years"? The argument can bring no consolation to the poor people that are sold up. If the fact be correctly stated, then there is an important screw loose somewhere else, and this screw requires to be very promptly tightened. In the abstract, indeed, "the charge of one rupee per head of population is not a high price to pay for the protection afforded;" but what if that single rupee cannot be paid without a feeling of pressure that does not tend to satisfaction with the Government that extracts it? The condition of the people demands some little consideration. The cost of government must be proportioned to the strength of the backs that have got to bear it. Our Indian administrators do not seem to get into their heads effectively the fact that they are dealing, not with a rich country, but with a population that is extremely and exceptionally poor. What would even a rich country like England say to a demand of one shilling out of every sovereign of income for the costs of military expenditure alone? How incomparably more grievous, then, is such a demand when so few of the population possess an income beyond the necessities of a very spare livelihood, and so many millions always hover on the margin of a bare existence?

Sir James Westland's logic on the famine grant is apparently unimpeachable. Strictly, perhaps, there is no such thing as a Famine Fund. Though

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

we expected an assignment of a crore and a half, we ought to applaud the generosity of the Government in conceding a crore. It is obviously perverse that the people should not be satisfied. The Government may, however, be reminded of the virtuously indignant protest of Lord Lytton against the suggestion that the so-called famine fund would not be steadily and strictly maintained. What is the value of that protest now? And what is the good of a precisian logic in face of a popular interpretation of the Government intentions emphasised with the solemn and burning protestation of a Governor-General? This famine fund—or whatever it may be designated—was a thing that touched the hearts and imaginations of the people, and might have been worked to issues of the highest general importance—a far higher importance than even the immediate purpose of protection from famine. But the ardent imagination of the people has been severely douched by the cold logic of the Government. Could there be a more cogent illustration of the hopeless inability of officialism to grasp the true basis of successful government of an Eastern population? The famine grant simply depends on a surplus. A surplus ought to have been always a matter of course. But how much could have been done with the idea! And how much has been undone by the chill substitution of a chunk of logic?

Consider this nicely balanced Budget from the point of view of the salt tax. "The salt tax, according to Mr. Connell"—we quote from an article in the *Times*, reprinted in INDIA for May—"was augmented by 18 million of rupees between 1884-85 and 1893-94. Sir James Westland's Budget shows a still further increase, making a total addition of about 23 million rupees levied on a necessity of life between 1884-85 and 1895-96." This increase, it is explained. "arises partly from an increase in the population, partly from their power of purchasing larger quantities of salt, partly from a windfall, and partly from a more uniform levy of the tax throughout India." The increase in the population means mainly an increase in misery; the more uniform levy of the tax throughout India means an injustice to some in order to relieve the galling pinch to others; the power of purchasing larger quantities is merely a delusive way of stating that larger quantities were in fact purchased. This tax may indeed be, as General Chesney thought, "the least irksome form of taxation that could be devised"—for the collectors of excise duty; for the population, it is certainly the most irksome and irritating. It is the standing opprobrium of Government. Salt is a necessity of life to man and animal; yet the duty placed upon it by a beneficent Government is something like 4,000 per cent. on the market price. The official compiler of the "Moral and Material Progress of India" Blue-book computes that, taking together agricultural and household salt, "over the whole of British India the average incidence of the salt tax is 4¾ annas (or about 4d) per head of the population." Like the rupee for military protection, fourpence a head for salt looks a very trifling affair indeed. But the significance of it is, not lightness of taxation, but deplorable poverty of the people.

The question of the poverty of India is fundamental, and will have to be seriously faced. The manipulation of Budget figures may serve to lull the uneasiness of those that take their views of India without independent examination from official sources; but at the best it can only slur over the real problems of Indian Government and administration. Instead of plucking the fleeces of the flock, we ought to be filling their bellies. There can be no real contentment with English rule so long as there exists such painful poverty, with the aggravation of irritating taxation. Yet it is the friendly feeling and confidence of the natives that forms the very basis of our Indian Empire. There is no sense in underrating the advantages of external security and internal peace; but, after all, when it comes to the pinch, these things are assumed as matters of course, and it would be folly to expect hungry men to be satisfied with such achievement on the part of the Government. These advantages are merely preliminary. The true work of government then begins. How little progress we have yet made, with all our good intentions and arduous labours, is only too painfully manifest. "With all its assessing, and irrigating, and railway building, and settling, the Government of India is not able, one year with another, to get an average of two rupees an acre rent from the cultivated area of the Empire of India. Upon this thin base is the superstructure of our costly and wasteful administration reared." Thus wrote Mr. A. J. Wilson in the *Investors' Review* for September last, in an article on "Indian Finance," to which attention was urgently drawn in these columns. That article may well stand as a commentary on the Indian Budget, profoundly damnatory yet thoroughly sound, until the Finance Minister takes his courage in both hands, and reforms his accounts. But the Finance Minister, it must be recognised, is bound hand and foot by the policy of the Government; and can the Government be moved to repress futile military adventure and foster the real development of internal prosperity even under the menace of catastrophe? Must it be a condition precedent that the menace be realised in disaster?

THE MOPLAHS AND THE LAND TAX IN INDIA.

BY J. DACOSTA.

Agriculture, which is the staple industry in India, was introduced in pre-historic times by immigrant races whose descendants still pursue the same avocation in our Indian provinces, the aborigines of the country having retired into hill tracts and forests where we find them now living in a state of semi-civilisation. The laws and customs of the immigrant communities remained long in force, and were respected even by the Muhammadan conquerors of India, probably because they were found to be based on principles of justice and the natural wants of the people, and doubtless also because their observance had produced so high a degree of prosperity that the wealth of India had become proverbial among the nations of the earth. A main drift of those laws

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

was to secure to each individual the fruit of his industry, while it laid on him an equitable share of the duty of protecting the lives and property of the community.

The Moplahs, who cultivate the land on the western side of the Indian peninsula, are one of those immigrant races, and are believed, from certain traits of character, to have Ishmaelitic blood in their veins. The British officials of the district represent them as "the most thrifty and industrious community in the Malabar;" and the following particulars regarding their laws and customs, which were published in the *Pioneer* of the 25th March last, may interest the reader:—

"From time immemorial it was a recognised law of landlord and tenant, that a lease was good for twelve years and, at the expiration of that term, it was an invariable custom to permit the tenant to renew his lease in paying twenty per cent. of the amount of the lease as a renewal fee. When that fee was paid, the landlord had no right to ask for any increase in the lease amount, or to oust the tenant."

Thus the landlord's claim for rent was permanently fixed by law, and the tenant was allowed to lay by savings, wherewith he could improve his farm and homestead, and tide over seasons of drought and inundation. The same code of laws protected the landlord from arbitrary demands of the *Rájá* or ruler of the country, by solemn injunctions resting on popular moral precepts, which in the course of time acquired the force and the very sanctity of religion. These conditions fully account for the accumulation of wealth which amazed nations less equitably ruled; they account also for the industrious and law-abiding spirit which distinguishes the people of India. The gentle manners of the Hindus, however, encouraged the aggression, while their wealth excited the cupidity, of the predatory hordes who overran and devastated many fertile tracts of the country, until the Mughal empire was established. That empire, which rested on despotism, was tottering under its own weight when the British first landed in India. Corruption and anarchy reigned in several provinces; satraps oppressed and despoiled the people, thus creating a state of things which enabled the Chartered Company of British Merchants, who had obtained from their Government the monopoly of the trade with India, to establish and extend their dominion in various directions far beyond the limits of their factories. Their rapid success in amassing wealth excited envy among their countrymen at home, and rumours of criminal methods being used by the English in India, in the acquisition of wealth, alarmed the moral sense of the nation. An enquiry was forthwith instituted into the Company's administration, which led to restrictions being placed on their powers, when their charter had to be renewed. Similar investigations were thenceforth periodically held, which facilitated the introduction of reform. Crown courts were established in the Presidency towns, undue restrictions which had been exercised over the press were removed, and other improvements were made in the administration.

Meanwhile the British Cabinet sought to obtain a power of direct interference in the management of affairs in India. The power they coveted was an irresponsible power, since Parliament was the only authority to which they were responsible, and Parliament contained no representative of the Indian populations whose interests were concerned in the matter. Nevertheless a Bill was passed creating a Board of Control for Indian Affairs, the president of which was to be a member of the Government, and the evil was aggravated by a clause providing secrecy for the proceedings of that board. This unconstitutional step led to the adoption of the unwise policy towards Afghanistan which involved us in our first war with that country—a war the disastrous and humiliating termination of which, in 1842, startled the world. The same irresponsible power prompted and enforced the discreditable policy which undoubtedly resulted in the rebellion and mutinies of 1857 and 1858. The appalling amount of blood and treasure expended in attempts to suppress the rebellion, and the anxiety which agitated the nation while British supremacy in India trembled in the balance, suggested a radical change in our system of governing India. The Chartered Company and the Board of Control were abolished, and the powers they had exercised were vested in a Principal Secretary of State, assisted by a Council, whose concurrence was declared to be essential in all matters involving the expenditure of Indian revenue. This restraint on the Indian Secretary's powers was, however, rendered illusory by other clauses of the Act of 1858 *for the better government of India*, which enabled him to elude the apparent restraint.

To the virtually irresponsible power thus entrusted to the Indian Secretary was due the revival of the condemned policy which had resulted in the Afghan war of 1838-42, and involved us again in an Afghan war equally disastrous to British prestige and British interests. To the same irresponsible power was due the revival of the unfortunate policy which had resulted in our great troubles of 1857-58, and was pursued afterwards in entire disregard of the pledges given in the Royal Proclamation of 1858, in which our Queen, addressing the people of India in the name of the British nation, said: "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessings of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil."

How far the Secretary of State charged with redeeming the pledges then given by our Sovereign on that solemn occasion endeavoured to fulfil his duty faithfully and conscientiously, was shown in the debate on the conduct of the Indian Government towards the Mahárájá of Kashmir, which took place in the House of Commons on the 5th July, 1890. A *résumé* of that noteworthy debate will be found in the *Law Magazine and Review* of November, 1893.

The alarm and indignation of our Indian allies at the conduct of the British Government towards the young Mahárájá of Kashmir has since been intensified by the conduct of that Government towards other Indian princes. In the Kashmir case charges of treasonable conspiracy and intended murder were brought against the Mahárájá as grounds for depriving him of the administration of his State and of the bulk of his revenues. The Mahárájá at once

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

denounced these charges as false and the documentary evidence adduced in their support as forgeries, and he demanded an enquiry into their alleged truth. Whereupon the charges were dropped without the enquiry asked for being granted.

The two disastrous wars mentioned above, and the equally unsuccessful expeditions sent for the subjugation of trans-frontier tribes, burdened the Indian Exchequer with heavy additions to the public debt, and increased taxation was imposed for defraying the interest of the new loans contracted. The land tax, from which the largest item of Indian revenue is derived, was enhanced so excessively that its collection is marked by cruel severities, as was stated in Parliament in the form of questions, to which the Government promised answers pending a reference to India, but has not given them as yet, although two years have since elapsed.

The Moplahs, being cultivators of land in private estates, are not directly liable for the land tax claimed by the Government; but they have been drawn within the sphere of the fiscal severities practiced in the Madras Presidency, through an enactment of the Government which—superseding the traditional law which protected them from arbitrary enhancements of rent—compelled their landlords to enforce excessive rents with the aid of the Executive and the British tribunals, in order that they might be in a position to satisfy the arbitrarily enhanced demands of the Government. The Moplahs, when stripped of their savings and unable any longer to pay the increased rents for which they were prosecuted, turned against the British officials whom they identified as their actual oppressors; and the country has since been in a chronic state of disturbance. The public has repeatedly been told that the Moplah outbreaks were due, not to any action of the Government in connexion with the land tax, but to religious fanaticism alone; but the well-informed organ of the Indian Civil Service, *The Pioneer*, takes a very different view of the question, as the following extract will show:—

"It is all very well to say that these recurring outbreaks are the result of pure religious fanaticism; but a deeper acquaintance with the subject will show that the Moplahs are men of strong religious feeling who make religion the channel through which their discontent finds escape. From whatever cause the Moplah does resort to arms, his Islamik principles compel him to die fighting against the Christian kafirs under whose sway he lives; for thus only is heaven assured and death is a release from the weariness of life in the present. Mr. Logan (the chief official in the district) undoubtedly lays his finger on the irritating sore when he says that the discontent is due to the oppressions and exactions of the system of land tenure; he says in effect 'give opportunities to the Moplahs, who are thrifty and industrious, to become prosperous, and they will become law-abiding.' In 1884, after the outbreak in Arcadekade, Mr. Logan urged upon the Government the adoption of measures in view of placing the land tenure system upon an improved footing, but nothing has been done to give practical effect to his suggestion."—*Pioneer*, March 25th, 1896.

The case of the Moplahs is the case of the cultivators throughout British India; for the burdens upon land have been oppressively increased everywhere, in order to provide for the growing military expenditure of the Government. The suffering and discontent engendered in these circumstances constitute a political danger which threatens to become imminent whenever complications in other parts of the world necessitate the removal from India of any material number of the British troops on whom we now rely for the safety of our Indian territories.

FRONTIERS AND FINANCE.

[BY AN INDEPENDENT POLITICIAN.]

The enquiring publicist is no doubt an official nuisance, if he may be a public benefactor. His supposed impertinence may be a national service, because there are many matters which the ordinary official wishes to express in his own way, if not to disguise. It is particularly so in Indian matters, and hence investigation is rendered the reverse of easy, and the investigator is considered a bore, whose motives are to be decried and whose path is to be strewn with the difficulties which constitute the attractions of an "obstacle race." I know no subject less easy to master than that which touches the frontier policy in India for the last twenty years, or ever since we abandoned the policy of masterly inactivity for that of ambitious muddle. It does not seem too hard to suggest that several persons are concerned in the art of mystification and misleading, in order to repel enquiry and to sustain a policy that would be unmistakably condemned if it could be studied clearly and consecutively in common with any other branch of Imperial policy and administration.

When a publicist is assured that the old school of Lawrence was a mistake, and that untold benefits have arisen from the acceptance of more progressive ideas, he naturally asks in what Parliamentary or Indian papers the forward frontier policy can be found clearly stated in its historical, military, financial and commercial bearings. Some returns and reports there are bearing on the subject, but they are not intended to be particularly intelligible. Surely this is a blunder of the first magnitude. Either the policy in question can be so expounded and defended, or it cannot. In the one case, there ought to be no attempt at confusion and secrecy; in the other, the arts of concealment, partial or obvious, become logical and natural, though eminently unsatisfactory.

It may be asked why anyone should desire to look at this matter in a common-sense way. The answer is that, if we are invited to approve, we are insulted if we are not entitled to understand. The forward frontier policy may be the best thing India has ever had since the government passed into Imperial hands. But, at any rate, it ought to bear investigation, and the facts connected with it ought to be found clearly arranged in State papers. Admiration based on ignorance is not worth much. It is the main thing required of Imperial politicians. Most of us are eager to acknowledge merit and genius where we can detect it. The world is not over-rich in splendid statesmanship and military strategy, and we are too ready to acknowledge their existence to rule India out of our sphere of observation and eulogy. Accordingly, it seems a great mistake

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

claim so much for this special policy, to tell us so little about it, and to brand as cheap economists or mean patriots or would-be revolutionists the persons who desire to be in quite as good a position to come to conclusions as the champions and fuglemen of the new frontier policy. It is a poor test of success when officialism starts the cheering, and will not let us know for what we are to cheer.

Why is not some specially competent statesman or military staff officer entrusted with the task of giving the natives of India and the people of Great Britain a succinct account of the different frontier expeditions of recent years, in a frank and careful manner? We want to know how they arose, what objects were aimed at, what they cost in men and money, and what are the net results from the military, financial, and commercial and political standpoints. If they will not bear such handling, there must be something about them that is not entirely satisfactory. Of course, we know as much as that in some cases, but the surface lessons might be more deeply imprinted under the weight of official knowledge, and perhaps there might be less reason for bragging and bluster in certain quarters. I know there are one or two papers bearing on the points in question, but they are inexact, insufficient, and they leave out material points in the story. The information desired should be much more minute than any yet given. It should include subsidies, the extra cost of political agents, the improvement of roads, the effect of success or failure upon trade and kindred matters. Nothing should be concealed. But as it is, to conceal as much as possible is thought good form.

When the above work has been done we could arrive at a judgment on the question as to whether the finances of India owe the greater part of their muddle and embarrassment to these exploits. "Yes," replies the official apologist, "you want us to prove your case." I answer for myself and a considerable class in England: "We have no theory one way or the other. We have but suspicions, and we want the truth. It is your policy, and it is for you to defend it." But beyond this statistical part, we desire to know whether India is really any safer or feels more secure, or is less liable to panic because of these forward frontier movements. If this cannot be fairly well established then the money spent has been wasted, more or less, with little to show for it. The case of Quetta is perhaps a strong one, because it lies outside our ordinary Indian frontier. Is there much else to show from the purely strategic point of view? For example, does the occupation of Chitral relative to some bigger movement prove to be of any better value than the occupation of Gilghit did in view of trouble in Chitral? As to popular opinion, it may be despised, but it must be considered. I am not sure that it has been soothed. But what do the forward men care? They talk of bazaar gossip when they want to justify a forward move, and despise it when it becomes a question as to the popular effect of that move. The largest benefit obtained from such advances as have been made is perhaps to be found in limiting the area about which military men can talk or work themselves up into contentions and contagious fever.

The cost to India of the forward frontier policy of the last eighteen years has been put at thirty millions and a half of English money. The sum includes operations in Egypt and Burma, but how they are to be ruled out I cannot see. India has three frontiers, (1) a normal frontier, (2) a forward frontier, and (3) a fanciful frontier. The last reaches from the Red Sea, westward, to Mekong, eastward. If all three kinds of expenditure were fairly stated, the sum named above would be largely exceeded. Now, the business man would have imagined that expenditure would have begun on frontier No. 1, instead of first reaching the other two, and have been largest thereon. Is that the fact? Sir Henry Brackenbury recently stated that the coast defences of Karachi, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, and Rangoon had been completed, and the bridge heads at Sukkur and Attock, on the Indus, finished. Forts at Rawal Pindi were making progress, but were not yet armed. Now, all these constructions have been subsequent in time and policy to the forward frontier movement. They thus prove its military insufficiency, because the normal frontier has had to be defended, in spite of the boast that by extending the frontier such works could be avoided—the early claim of the forward school. Financially, therefore, we seem to come to these points: that much of our money has been wasted on No. 2, and perhaps on No. 3; that after all we have had to spend money sequentially on No. 1, and conceal the process; and (3) that native and English opinion would at any time, on reason being shown, have sanctioned legitimate expenditure on frontier No. 1 without grumbling.

Here let me remark that, speaking for myself and the independent class, it is a mistake to say that we grudge the money to make India strong. Cheap sneers about weak politicians who object to military expenditure are beside the mark. The money for actual and not imaginary defence can always be found. It is money well spent. Take out the eighteen millions of money in English pounds spent in Afghanistan, and see how far it would have gone in building and arming the coast and Indus defences! It would have paid for the entire work and left money in hand for army improvements.

It is further to be borne in mind that forward frontier expenditure has weakened India for internal and natural frontier defence in other ways than the one I have just mentioned, though that is serious enough. "I believe there is no greater extravagance than to maintain a large army and to keep that army unready for war," remarked Sir Henry Brackenbury in speaking on the Military Budget. Now, it so happens that whilst money has been spent on frontier advances, it has not been spent on matters that wanted attention. I take mobilisation first. The first step in that reform began five years ago. It was then, as Sir Henry Brackenbury concedes, "only in embryo." Forty-nine and a half lakhs are to be spent in the coming year in these preparations. Take transport second: it is "our greatest difficulty in India," according to the same unquestionable authority. The Chitral campaign proved that transport arrangements were not what they ought to be. Here, then, are examples of an ambitious policy and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

its effects. We extend our frontiers, and we do not proportionately strengthen, but weaken, the effective force of the army, because its readiness for action is neglected.

It will be said that this attack on the forward frontier school is inconsiderate and unjust. Does not such a complaint emphasise the necessity for some statement of the kind mentioned in a foregoing paragraph? I hold that it does; and I further contend that it shows the necessity for more caution in handling frontier questions and provoking frontier squabbles. I shelter myself, finally, behind Sir Henry Brackenbury's own admission as to the smaller and punitive frontier wars. In the recent Budget debate he said: "The past five years have been years of great difficulty for the Military Department. There have been a great number of frontier expeditions, which have upset our Budgets, and have been unwillingly concurred in by the Commander-in-Chief and myself." What a condemnation is this of some earlier and more costly frontier expeditions, wantonly forced, and leading to the abandonment of parts of so-called scientific frontiers!

MAGISTRATES ON TOUR.

BY A. NUNDY.

There is one aspect of the question relating to the separation of judicial and executive functions in India which has not yet received the notice it deserves, causing as it does great hardship and annoyance. The criminal administration of justice, except in certain heinous offences, is in the hands of magistrates who are at the same time executive officers. As such it is their duty to go on tour for at least three months of the winter season. They have a variety of duties to perform, for the due discharge of which it is, no doubt, desirable that they should go on tour. But the Government is well aware, though it takes no notice, of the serious consequences to suitors who are compelled to resort to these magistrates. There is some sort of a rule that an official going on tour is to leave at headquarters a memorandum stating the particular places he will pass through on various dates. Such a memorandum may be left, but it is useless for practical purposes, as the itinerary may be changed at the will of the officer, or under circumstances over which he has no control. Take the district magistrate as an instance. Whilst on tour he receives information that a matter of the greatest urgency requires his presence at headquarters. He proceeds thither forthwith and after transacting his business returns to his camp, say, in a couple of days, and resumes his tour. But of course his former programme is entirely upset. Or it has begun to rain heavily, and, the roads becoming impassable, he is detained for three or four days. Or it may be that he is not successful in obtaining the *shikar* which had formed part of his programme, and he therefore defers his departure. It is well known that officers often remain several days in one spot, where there is a likelihood of obtaining sport, when, according to the memorandum they have left at headquarters, they ought to be miles away. Such a memorandum is therefore of little or no use.

What, then, is the consequence? Let us take a typical case. A person is desirous of filing a complaint before a magistrate. He goes to headquarters, and there learns that the magistrate will be at a certain village on the following day. He proceeds to this village and finds that the magistrate is not there, nor is he able to obtain any information as to when he is likely to arrive, or where he is to be found. He waits a day or two, and then learns that the magistrate has changed his route and will not visit that place at all. He then tries to ascertain the whereabouts of this official, and eventually finds his way to him. He institutes his complaint, and a date is fixed for the accused to attend and the witnesses for the prosecution to be heard, at a village called (let us say) B——. He returns to headquarters, and proceeds to the pleader, or *mukhtar*, whom he wishes to engage, and desires him to take up his case, which is to be heard on tour. Much to the suitor's surprise and disappointment, he finds that the legal practitioners either absolutely decline to go on tour, or ask such a sum for their services as is absolutely prohibitive to him, for he is not only required to pay a heavy fee per day, but also the travelling expenses, which, for a carriage specially hired or a palanquin, will be pretty high. He tries other pleaders and *mukhtars*, and often visits half a dozen, without being able to come to terms. As a last resource he engages a third-rate man, whom he would never have thought of engaging if the case had been heard at headquarters. On the appointed day he proceeds with his *mukhtar* and witnesses to the village B——, and learns to his chagrin that the magistrate is camped ten miles off. The *mukhtar* and the witnesses are willing to proceed further. The suitor is, therefore, obliged to open his purse and satisfy them, till at last he arrives at the magistrate's camp about noon, and finds that his case has been struck off in default. He presents himself before this functionary, who reprimands him sharply for being late; but, on the *mukhtar's* explaining the cause of the delay, and after much expostulation, the case is restored to the file and another date fixed for the hearing. Or it may happen that when the complainant arrives at the village B——, he finds that the magistrate has not yet arrived, but is shortly expected. He therefore waits, and in the course of the afternoon he sees that official take his seat in court. The magistrate takes up some executive or revenue work, or some *chalan* case (*i.e.*, a case sent up by the police), with the result that though the complainant waits about the court till 7 or 8 p.m., his case is never called on. He has, therefore, to seek for lodgings for the night for himself, his witnesses, and his *mukhtar*, to whom, of course, he has to pay another fee. Often the only lodging to be had is the shade of an adjacent tree, where, in the company of others equally unfortunate with himself, he seeks a well-earned repose. The next day the magistrate moves his camp a dozen miles further, and thither proceed in his train the unfortunate individuals who desire to have their wrongs redressed. Often the suitor becomes so weary of being dragged about from one place to another that he thinks the wisest thing

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

he can do is to compromise the matter with his opponent. It is by no means an uncommon event that persons who have suffered a wrong sit quietly and bear it, rather than resort to courts which, by the mode in which they administer justice, would inflict on them much greater suffering and injury.

But the offenders who are *chalaned* by the police are most to be pitied. A person is alleged to have caused grievous hurt to another. He is arrested by the police, who institute an enquiry, and then send him, together with the witnesses for the prosecution, to the magistrate who has jurisdiction to try the case. The police have some sort of idea that the magistrate is on tour, but they are ignorant as to the exact locality in which he is to be found. Sometimes they go in search of him, and sometimes they go on to headquarters, where they receive precise information where to find him. The prisoner is dragged about from place to place, and with him the witnesses, who usually accompany him, as they have signed a bond to appear before the magistrate, and the surest way to find him is to accompany the police. The prisoners have, indeed, a hard time, often subsisting on parched grain, for they are not at liberty to cook for themselves, and they have no one who can do it for them. Often late in the evening they are taken ten or twelve miles to a police-station where they can be kept in custody, to be marched back again in the morning to the magistrate's camp. They are deprived of all legal aid, except such as can be obtained at the camp, for a few *mukhtars*, usually the most incompetent of their class, follow the camp of a magistrate. Often when prisoners would be allowed by the magistrate to be out on bail, they find it hard in such out-of-the-way places to discover anyone who will be willing to stand security for them.

As regards another class of cases, also, the grievance is great, and calls for immediate redress. The district magistrate not only tries important criminal cases, but he is also invested with appellate powers as regards the decisions of second and third-class magistrates. He may hear in a month 70 or 80 cases in appeal or revision. In most of these cases pleaders and *mukhtars* are engaged. But when he is on tour the aggrieved parties have often to do without any legal advice, notwithstanding the fact that some intricate points of law are involved in the case. The district magistrate, of all others, has the most onerous duties to perform. He is the chief administrative head of the district. He is responsible for the well-being of the district and for the due collection of the Government revenue, and naturally he devotes the best part of his time to his executive and revenue functions. Judicial work is to him an irksome and thankless task. Yet he has before him scores of cases in which the judgments and orders of subordinate courts have been brought to him on appeal. Is it to be wondered at if, under the pressure of other work, which is even greater whilst he is on tour, he is obliged to postpone these cases from day to day, so that frequently the term of imprisonment has expired against which the appeal had been filed? When he does take up the appeal, it is simply to go through it in a perfunctory manner, often just glancing at the record and passing the stereotyped order, "I see no grounds for interfering with this judgment. Appeal dismissed." Sometimes the district magistrate takes up the appeals late in the evening. Say there are twenty appeals. Of these five have been sent in by prisoners from the gaol, and fifteen have been filed by the accused in person or by their legal advisers. The names of these fifteen appellants are called out; eight are found to be present, either in person or through their pleaders. They are informed that their cases will be taken up on the next day or the day after. The seven appellants who are absent have their appeals dismissed in default. Seven cases have thus been decided in two minutes, and in the monthly return sent to the Government the magistrate gets credit for these cases as so much work done. Now remain the five appeals sent in by the prisoners in gaol. The clerk takes one up and reads ground number 1 of the appeal when he is interrupted by the judge, who says "That will do—I see it is the plea usually put forward by all appellants. Appeal dismissed." The clerk takes up another appeal which p rhaps meets a similar fate. He takes up a third with the remark, "This is an appeal from the judgment of Babu or Munshi So-and-so." He is asked to read the judgment, or if it is in English the magistrate reads it for himself. If he confirms the judgment he gives the subordinate officer a sharp rebuke for the slipshod manner in which the case was tried, or observes that he had failed to inflict a sufficient punishment. If he decides to reverse the judgment he puts it on record that none but an idiot could have believed the evidence on which the conviction was based. The two remaining appeals are then summarily dismissed, with the result that in a quarter of an hour twelve cases have been disposed of. To English readers this may seem an exaggeration. But it is an every-day affair with district magistrates, especially when they are on tour. There are, of course, magistrates who faithfully discharge their duties, and others would do so, but that they have no time to spare. Their efficiency as district magistrates is not decided according to the judicial work done by them, but by the manner in which they have discharged their executive and revenue functions.

Another serious evil resulting from the district magistrate's tour is that in certain cases where persons have been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment by the subordinate courts, they would have had a chance of being let out on bail if the magistrate had been at headquarters, whereas days may now elapse before it would be possible to find him and obtain the requisite order. I need not enumerate further evils that arise from the conversion of judicial officers into peripatetic administrators of justice. There is not a single redeeming feature in the practice. All concerned have to suffer—the litigants, the office establishment, and the legal practitioners—while the magistrates themselves are made the reluctant instruments of inflicting a vast amount of suffering on others. The only person who is delighted, and who looks forward to the touring season, is the sporting magistrate. Even he might confess that it would be better if his judicial functions were taken away from him.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA IN THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

There seems to be a growing desire among those who are interested in the welfare of India to see India represented in the House of Commons. Recent events have accentuated that desire. The fact need not create any surprise, least of all among Englishmen. England has generously provided the people of India with a liberal education, she has instilled and stimulated in their minds her own cherished ideas of liberty and self-government, and she has supplied a lofty ideal, the attainment of which is the aim and aspiration of many an educated Indian. The longing of Indians for some voice in the government of their country is not merely sentimental. Stern facts have forced upon Indians the conviction that they would thereby be advancing their best interests. The barriers which separate the governing classes from the people are of such a nature that those on whom the responsibility of government rests—often from the lack of adequate information, and sometimes from an absence of sympathy—are led to the committal of acts which are hurtful to the feelings and detrimental to the interests of the people. Occasionally it has happened that Anglo-Indian officials, situated as they are at present, have found it impossible to act impartially and without prejudice in deciding questions in which they have a personal interest. But, more than this, we have learned by experience that even the Government of India has not a free hand in the exercise either of its legislative or of its administrative functions, but that it is liable to be influenced, and even over-ruled, by the Secretary of State for India, who is himself subordinate to the British Parliament. It has happened, and may happen again, that when there is a consensus of opinion in India, when all classes, official and non-official, English and Indian, are united in demanding a certain measure, and the Government of India itself has acknowledged the justice and reasonableness of the demand, the Secretary of State chooses to ignore this unanimous expression of opinion. The case of the import duties on cotton goods affords a notable example of this danger. In 1894 the Government of India had to face a heavy deficit of about 250 lakhs of rupees. It resorted to every possible expedient to raise the amount. The provincial balances were placed under requisition—involving the cessation of administrative improvements under the local governments; public works sanctioned by the Government of India were brought to a standstill by the diversion of the money which was to be applied to them; and the Famine Insurance Fund was swallowed up. Yet the deficit was not made good, and, under these circumstances, India with united voice asked for the imposition of a duty on all imported articles. Europeans and Indians, officials and non-officials, joined in making the demand. The duties were imposed, but cotton goods were exempted. The non-official members of the Viceregal Council, European and Indian, voted in a body against the exemption. The official members voted for it, but under protest. The members of the India Council recorded minutes of dissent. But the *fiat* of the Secretary of State for India carried the day. It is not, therefore, surprising that the conviction should have forced itself upon the minds of many thoughtful persons that to secure for ourselves an effectual hearing an agitation confined within India alone is of no avail, but that our views should in some manner be represented directly to the people of the United Kingdom and their Parliament.

Recent events have confirmed us in this belief. For years we in India agitated in vain for the expansion and the reform of the Councils. But when Mr. Bradlaugh took up the question in the House of Commons the desired boon (though in a modified form) was soon granted. For the last two decades there has been an unceasing cry that a Commission should be appointed to investigate the expenditure incurred, and the revenue obtained, by the Government of India. This cry met for a long time with no response. But of late years India has had the good fortune to secure some doughty champions in the House of Commons in Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and others, with the result that a Royal Commission is now engaged upon a portion, at any rate, of the desired investigation. Yet it was, so to say, by accident that India secured the support of a number of Members of Parliament of considerable weight and influence, and now, as ill luck will have it, many of these members have lost their seats in the House of Commons. How much better, therefore, would it be for us if, in addition to these friends in need, we could send our own representatives from India.

It may perhaps be said that we have our Legislative and Provincial Councils and that we should content ourselves with expressing our views in these assemblies. But the free expression of our views is not expected or tolerated by the officials. On the other hand, it is resented, as, for example, in the case of Mr. P. M. Mehta, in the Viceregal Council, in the debate on the Police Amendment Bill. The exercise of the right of interpellation—a boon generously granted by the British Parliament—is looked upon with horror by Governors holding autocratic views, like Sir Charles Elliott, who discourage it in every possible way and, by giving evasive answers, render a valuable privilege almost nugatory. To expect further reform in the constitution of our Councils, and extension of the privileges connected with them, is at present, I am afraid, out of the question. But even if we were placed on a better footing in the Councils, of what practical value would the change be to us? The elected members can never expect to be in a majority. They must be outvoted by the official and the nominated members. It is only public opinion in the United Kingdom and the authority of Parliament that can effectually redress our grievances. Hence it is that we desire that India should be represented in Parliament.

The proposal is doubtless a large one, and there are difficulties in the way. It may be condemned by some as raising a question that is beyond the range of practical politics. It will, perhaps, be said that no measure could be formulated for the representation of India in Parliament, unless it were part of a comprehensive scheme by which a similar privilege

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

was granted to the colonies and other British dependencies, and that for this privilege no demand is made on their part. But the reason for their contentment is obvious. The tendency in these days is towards self-government. British colonies prefer self-government to sending representatives to a foreign Parliament which could legislate on their domestic affairs. The time is not far distant when Ireland will obtain a Parliament to legislate on Irish local affairs. A similar privilege granted to Scotland and Wales would, it is contended by some whose opinions carry weight, operate as much to the benefit of those countries as to the advantage of the Imperial Parliament, which is at present unable to devote due time and attention to its accumulation of business. How, then, if a solution of the difficulty were found in the formation of a Home Rule Parliament in England to deal with English affairs? It might then be practicable to constitute a new Imperial Parliament composed of representatives from England, Ireland and Wales and the several colonies and dependencies desiring to be represented in it, or to whom it would be desirable to grant representation. The colonies possess at present their own Parlialiaments, which legislate on their own particular concerns, in respect of which they would not tolerate interference on the part of England. These colonies, as matters stand at present, have no desire to be represented in a Parliament in which they might be called upon to legislate on matters in which they have no special or direct interest, but they would not have the same objection to forming part of an assembly whose sole function it would be to deal with Imperial affairs. To such an assembly India might well claim the privilege of sending representatives, without laying itself open to the objection that might with good reason be put forward by the English people against allowing foreigners—as they sometimes misname their Indian fellow-subjects—with an imperfect knowledge of their needs, habits and customs, to legislate on their domestic affairs.

When such a Parliament could be constituted is for the future to decide. Meantime it is due to the British nation to acknowledge the generosity of which they have given two notable instances within the last few years. They have shown that they are above race prejudices in this matter, and that they are prepared to elect as their own representatives in the House of Commons Indians who have taken up their residence in England, or frequently visit England, and are conversant with English desires amd aims—for I take it that, but for the general revulsion of feeling in favour of the "Unionists," Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee would have been elected last summer by the Liberals at Barrow, as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was elected in 1892 by the Liberals of Central Finsbury. What we ought, therefore, at present to look forward to is the chance of Indians of education and position settling down in England, and being selected as candidates for British constituencies. To such candidates it is the duty of all who are interested in the progress of India to lend hearty support—provided always that they come to England fortified with credentials showing that they possess the confidence of the people of India.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

When Sir W. Wedderburn rose to move the adjournment of the House of Commons on May 18, in order to call attention to Lord G. Hamilton's recent re-arrangement of the Indian cotton duties, he was supported by a large number of members. The whole of the Opposition, except the Front Bench, rose in their places.

It is not usual for the Front Bench to support a motion for adjournment, but Mr. T. Shaw, the late Solicitor-General for Scotland, acted on this occasion with the rank and file of the Liberal party. It was remarked that not even a solitary Ministeralist joined in the effort to secure a hearing for the complaints of India.

Sir W. Wedderburn rose from the top corner seat of the second bench below the gangway. On the bench behind him were Mr. John Dillon and Mr. Michael Davitt, and on the bench before him, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Labouchere. There was, except on the Front Benches, a fairly good attendance of members throughout the debate. Sir Henry Fowler's speech, which provoked much angry comment among Liberal members, afforded Mr. Balfour an excuse for moving the closure, and the Speaker an excuse for suggesting that the motion should forthwith be withdrawn.

The present Government, as Sir W. Harcourt says, lives upon closure. But the responsibility in this instance lay chiefly with Sir H. Fowler who, after a consultation with Lord George Hamilton behind the Speaker's chair, deliberately and vehemently attacked a motion which the fighting strength of his party had agreed in supporting. It was certainly an odd position for a Liberal leader whose policy had been reversed by his successor.

The effect of Sir H. Fowler's intervention was to closure many members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee who were prepared, and had intended, to speak. But the discussion was not altogether fruitless. Besides directing public attention to the question of the cotton duties, and securing from Lord G. Hamilton a promise to produce the minutes of members of the India Council, it extracted from Mr. Balfour what amounts to an honourable pledge that the Indian Budget shall be brought on at a time when it can be "adequately" discussed.

The following are the terms of the motion of which Lord George Hamilton has given notice with reference to the expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan: "That Her Majesty having directed a military expedition of Her Native forces charged upon the revenues of India to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops, this House consents that the ordinary pay of any troops so despatched, as well as the ordinary charges of any vessels belonging to the Government of India that may be employed in this expedition, which would have been charged upon the resources of India if such troops or vessels had remained in that country or seas adjacent, shall continue to be so chargeable: Provided that if it shall become necessary to replace the troops or vessels so withdrawn by other vessels

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

or Native forces, then the expense of raising, maintaining, and providing such vessels and forces shall, in so far as may not be otherwise provided, be repaid out of any moneys which may be provided by Parliament for the purposes of the said expedition."

According to Mr. Balfour's announcement on the eve of the Whitsuntide recess, the motion will be submitted on Thursday, June 4th. Notice has been given of the following amendments:—

Mr. John Morley:

Line 2, leave out all after "That," and insert "it is inexpedient that any portion of the charges of the Indian force that is being despatched to Africa in aid of Egyptian troops, whether ordinary charges or extraordinary, should be imposed upon the revenues of India."

Mr. Buchanan:

Line 2, leave out all after "That," and insert "in the opinion of this House, no part of the cost of the troops in Africa in aid of Egyptian troops should be charged upon the revenues of India."

Mr. Maclean:

Line 4, leave out all after "troops," and insert "this House is of opinion that no portion expenses, ordinary or extraordinary, of the troops employed in this expedition should, during their absence from India, be charged upon the Indian revenues."

The question would probably have been raised on a motion for adjournment before the Whitsuntide recess, had not Mr. Sydney Gedge, on May 13th, given notice of a "blocking" motion. He has undertaken, on an early day, "to call attention to the action of the Government in employing Indian troops in the Sudan; and to move a resolution." Mr. Sydney Gedge's interest in India is a somewhat uncertain quantity. But he was able, by employing the forms of the House, to prevent discussion of the question, and therefore—whether intentionally, or not—to accommodate the Government.

It is officially announced that "the Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Hungerford Tudor Boddam, barrister-at-law, to be a Judge of the High Court at Madras, in the place of Mr. George Arthur Parker, who has been permitted to retire."

The list of birthday honours published on May 20th contained the announcement that Her Majesty had been pleased to direct that Professor Max Müller be sworn a member of the Privy Council.

Professor Max Müller, is well known as a distinguished philological and Oriental scholar. He is a son of Wilhelm Müller, the German poet, and was born at Dessau in 1823. He studied in Berlin, Leipzig, and Paris, and in 1846 he came to England to collate MSS. at the East India House and the Bodleian Library. He was on the point of returning to Germany when the late Baron Bunsen, then Prussian Minister in London, persuaded him to stay, and the East India Company engaged him to publish the first edition of the Rig-Veda at their expense. In 1848 he settled at Oxford. He was elected Taylorian Professor in 1854, and a Fellow of All Souls in 1858. In 1868 the University founded a Chair of Comparative Philology to which he was nominated in the deed of foundation.

Professor Max Müller is not the first Oxford Professor who has been elected to the dignity of a Privy Councillor while still in the active discharge of the duties of his Chair in the University. In 1871 the late Mr. Montagu Bernard, who was Chichele Professor of International Law at Oxford, was, on his return from Washington, where he had gone as one of the High Commissioners for the settlement of the "Alabama claims," sworn of the Privy Council in recognition of his learning and public services.

Among the birthday honours the dignity of Knighthood was conferred upon the Hon. George Arthur Parker, late Judge of the High Court, Madras. The following promotions and appointments were announced from the India Office:—To be Knights Commanders of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India—William Erskine Ward, C.S.I., Chief Commissioner of Assam, and Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Alfred Swaine Lethbridge, M.D., C.S.I.; to be a Companion, James Fairbairn Finlay, Secretary to the Government of India in the Finance and Commerce Department; to be Companions of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire—Henry O'Connell Cardozo, Superintendent of Revenue Survey, Madras; Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Benjamin Franklin; Thomas Higham, Chief Engineer and Secretary to the Government of the Punjab in the Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch; Major John Shakespear, D.S.O., Leinster Regiment; Sardar Ratan Singh, President of the Council of Regency of the Jind State; Raja Bhup Indra Bikram Singh, of Piagpur; Major (Honorary Lieutenant-Colonel) James John Macleod, Officiating Commandant Behar Light Horse; Captain Norman Franks; Arthur Henry Plunkett; and Rao Bahadur Chunilal Venilal.

The popularity of the Empire of India Exhibition, the most attractive of the many exhibitions held at Earl's Court, was by no means exhausted when its doors were closed last autumn, and it is not surprising that its principal features have been preserved in the Empire of India and Ceylon Exhibition, opened to the public on May 9th. The ingenuity of Mr. Imre Kiralfy has also provided new features, which promise to make "India and Ceylon" even more successful than its predecessor. Chief among these is a fine panorama of ancient Rome, which had already been exhibited at some of the principal cities on the Continent. The canvas measures 349 feet in circumference, and is 50 feet high. The scene, realistic as a living picture, represents the Eternal City as it appeared in A.D. 312, when Constantine made his triumphal entry. Craftsmen from various parts of the Indian Empire, from the Himalaya to the Point de Galle, are located in the "Indian City," and the little workshops which line the streets attract crowds of sightseers curious to observe the primitive tools of the Indian or Cingalese artificer and ready to marvel at his patient skill. Towering above the "City" is the "Great Wheel"—distinctly a product of Western ideas. The educational side of the exhibition is represented also by collections of curiosities and the like from Northern India, Nepal, Ceylon and the Straits Settlements. The exhibition will doubtless prove to be one of the chief attractions of the summer season in London.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JUNE, 1896.

THE PREDOMINANT PARTNER.

"Her Majesty's Government propose that the ordinary pay and allowances of the Indian native troops under orders for Suakin should continue to be borne by the revenues of India."—Lord G. HAMILTON, May 15th, 1896.

"I have been able, with the assistance of the Indian Government, to come to a solution the equity of which no human being can dispute. *It has been accepted in Lancashire*, and, so far as I know, *whatever agitation there was in India* has altogether died out."—Lord G. HAMILTON on the Cotton Duties, May 18th, 1896.

"Every member of this House, whether elected by an English, or by a Scotch, or by an Irish constituency, is a member for India."—Sir H. H. FOWLER, February 21st, 1895.

THE Parliamentary Report issued with the present number of INDIA illustrates, with almost dramatic completeness, one of the gravest dangers which exist side by side with the undoubted and manifold benefits of British rule in India. It is the danger that India should at times be governed, or, at any rate, seem to be governed, not in the interests of India (which has no votes), but in the interests of the United Kingdom (which has). On May 18th Sir W. Wedderburn moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to show how that Lord George Hamilton's recent re-arrangement of the Indian cotton duties—a re-arrangement suggested by Lancashire and eminently satisfactory to Lancashire—had increased the burdens of Indian taxpayers, and especially of the poorest classes. The motion was withdrawn under threat of the closure. Lord George Hamilton refused to accede in any degree to the unanimous request of public opinion in India. Meantime, on May 11th and subsequent days, he and his colleagues had been engaged in evading questions as to the expenses of the Indian troops who have been despatched to the Sudan by the British Government. After a good deal of ambiguity and procrastination, it was at last admitted that the poverty-stricken taxpayers of India would be required to pay the ordinary expenses of the troops whose services had been borrowed by her prosperous rulers. To complete the story, and the moral, we have only to reflect that the cotton duties were re-imposed on account of the financial difficulties of the Government of India, and that those financial difficulties were undoubtedly due chiefly to extravagant military expenditure. That is to say, (1) we impose an excessive military establishment and a "forward" frontier policy upon the taxpayers of India; (2) we sanction the re-imposition of cotton duties in order to save their Government, impoverished by our military schemes and methods, from open insolvency; (3) at the bidding of Lancashire we readjust the cotton duties in a way which excites vehement and widespread indignation in India; and then (4) we calmly borrow Indian troops, at the expense of the Indian revenues, to conduct our military operations in the Sudan. And yet, in the beautiful words of Sir Henry Fowler, every member of the House of Commons is a member for India!

The proceedings of the Government with reference to the Indian troops have, as will be seen from the extracts printed on another page, provoked much unfavourable comment in English newspapers. What sort of comment are they likely to produce in India? A telegram dated Simla, May 10th, briefly announced that native troops were to be sent to Suakin for garrison duty. On the following day, and again on May 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 18th, and 19th questions on the subject were addressed to various members of the Government, and the several answers vouchsafed to them betrayed a really alarming degree of carelessness, and even levity, in dealing with a grave Imperial question. The Government, it would seem, had not deemed the matter to be worth serious discussion. Lord George Hamilton airily informed Mr. Morley that the expenses of the Indian troops would be divided between the British Government and the Government of India. The words were no sooner out of his mouth than the Chancellor of the Exchequer warned Mr. Labouchere that it would, nevertheless, be wrong to infer that the expenses were not to be borne by the Egyptian Government. Mr. Balfour added that they would be divided between the three Governments. On the important constitutional question whether a resolution to permit the employment of the troops would be submitted to Parliament, there was a similar variety of impromptu opinions. Lord George Hamilton, who might have been expected to know something of the Act of 1858, declared that such a resolution was unnecessary. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach seemed to think it was necessary. Finally, Mr. Balfour gave the House to understand that a resolution would be submitted as a matter of courtesy, not as a matter of law. This confusion of tongues is astounding. The

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Government had evidently decided at some date prior to May 10th to employ Indian troops in the Sudan. But it had not taken Parliament into its confidence, and when private members asked questions the answers only revealed the uncertainty or the nescience of the Cabinet. Even when the Government had undertaken to submit the necessary resolution, Mr. Balfour, who is one of the most casual of men, seemed to think that it might suitably be used as a mere lever to expedite discussion on the Agricultural Rating Bill. It was ultimately postponed until the House re-assembles after the Whitsuntide recess and, according to Mr. Balfour's latest forecast, the resolution, of which Lord George Hamilton has given notice, will be discussed on Thursday, June 4th. The indifference with which Ministers were prepared to over-ride the law and to ignore precedent is characteristic of the temper in which they have borrowed the troops. The pity of it is that there *is* a precedent for borrowing Indian troops at the expense of India. In New Zealand in 1860 and 1861, in the Abyssinian expedition of 1867, in the Perak expedition of 1875, in Afghanistan in 1878, in Egypt in 1882, and in the Sudan in 1885, the predominant partner compelled a loan on these inequitable terms, which, it goes without saying, are never conceded in the converse case. In all these cases except two India was required to pay the ordinary expenses of the borrowed troops. The exceptions were in 1878 and in 1882 when India defrayed the whole cost of the operations, receiving, however, a grant of £5,000,000 in the first case and of £500,000 in the second. There are, however, two further exceptional cases of a more creditable type. When we borrowed Indian troops for the China expedition in 1859-60, and for Malta in 1878, we were handsome enough to pay the bill. It would be interesting to know, and the Government ought to be asked, on what principle, if any, the differentiation is made. The question can, as it happens, be put without reference to comparatively ancient history. Lord George Hamilton announced in almost one and the same breath on May 15th that India would bear no charge for the troops borrowed for Mombasa, though she would be required to pay the ordinary expenses of the troops borrowed for the Sudan. Where does the difference come in? Is it all a matter of caprice, or is the Cabinet acting upon an intelligible, though inscrutable, plan?

What has India to do with the Sudan or with Egypt, for whose benefit, according to Lord Salisbury, the present expedition has been undertaken? It may be said that India, as a part of the British Empire, is interested in all Imperial undertakings. Even so, it would hardly follow that she should pay for them. But if this argument were seriously employed it would have to be addressed, as it is not, to the Colonies as well. There is a simple and obvious test of the fairness or unfairness of charging to India the expenses of her borrowed troops. If we had sent out an equal number of troops from England to do the same work, should we have thought of placing *their* expenses upon India? The question needs only to be stated, and the notion is seen to be preposterous. Yet the proposal of the Cabinet is not essentially different. The taxpayers of India maintain their enormous army on the ground, or the theory, that it is necessary for their protection. When we borrow a portion of that protection, and thereby reduce it, the really equitable course would be not only to pay all the expenses of the borrowed portion, but also to compensate India for the temporary loss. The truth is that the thing does not admit of argument. When British troops are sent to India their expenses, from the moment of embarkation, are paid by India. More than that, India, as Mr. Hanbury has more than once remarked with something very like indignation, pays a heavy annual contribution to the War Office on account of the training of recruits in the United Kingdom. Some admirers of the Government approve its present proposal on the ground that, as they say, India does not pay for the British Fleet. Yet it is notorious that India pays, and pays heavily, for every vessel which human ingenuity can assign to her share. Considerations like these are, we may be very sure, present to the minds of educated Indians, and, to put it mildly, are not exactly conducive to gratitude or respect. The Simla correspondent of the *Times*, who is not likely to be accused of excessive sympathy with Indian opinion, telegraphed on May 21st that a strong feeling prevailed that the pay and allowances of troops withdrawn from India for service which in no way concerned India should be borne by the Home Government. "India loses the services "of her regiments temporarily. She will have to pay "the pensions of Sepoys who die. She does not "benefit in the least by the expedition into the "Sudan, and she can ill afford to weaken the "garrison now that heavier responsibilities have "been incurred by the occupation of an advanced "strategic position at Chitral and in other parts of "of the North-West frontier." Precisely, and the Simla correspondent of the *Times*, might have added that the occupation of those advanced strategic positions was, and is, a costly business undertaken by Englishmen in defiance of the Indian taxpayer, but at their expense. One thing is certain. An incident like the present is not regarded in India as the result of reasoned debate. It is regarded with bitterness as a mere exercise of superior and selfish force, and, therefore, it strikes at the roots of popular loyalty and British authority. The compulsory loan of Indian troops for the Sudan suggests many questions much larger than itself. The writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times*, who believes that the decision now to be given "may do more than "any other action taken by the British Parliament "since the mutiny of 1857 to confirm or to shake "the loyalty of India," points out that in tropical and sub-tropical Africa the employment of Indian troops may become a permanent necessity. But that is not the whole of the matter. The contention of educated Indians is that, in very many important departments of Indian administration and policy, India—to employ Lord Salisbury's expressive term—is "bled" for the benefit of the United Kingdom. It is greatly to be regretted that our Government should lend colour to this accusation:

"Pudet hæc opprobria nobis
Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

LORD G. HAMILTON'S DEFENCE.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to the Memorial of the Indian Parliamentary Committee touching the re-arrangement of the cotton duties, and his defence of the existing imposts in the House of Commons on May 18th, are specimens of reasoning well worthy of the cause they are intended to serve. The argument from protection which has been so frequently combated is again paraded as an excuse for the transference of the duties from yarns to manufactured goods. "It was considered," Lord G. Hamilton says, "that the best way of relieving the trade (Indian as "well as foreign) from artificial restrictions, and of "excluding all semblance of protection, would be to "make all yarns altogether free of duty and to place "a duty on all woven goods." The proposal sounds plausible. But its fallacious character becomes evident at once on examination. The semblance of protection—an appropriate term—here alluded to is obviously the one and a half per cent. which, Lancashire manufacturers stated, was saved by the Indian mills in paying duty on yarns instead of on manufactured goods. When the tax on machinery and other necessities of manufacture is estimated it will be found, as Mr. Hume and others have pointed out, that this small margin, this semblance of protection, is reduced to vanishing point. Moreover by the new duty on manfactured goods the hand-looms as against the power-looms must secure at least the same degree of protection as that which Indian looms secured against Lancashire looms under the previous system. But "Lord George Hamilton does "not share the expectation that the 3½ per cent. "duty on mill-woven goods will enable hand-looms "to compete successfully with power-mills or to "reduce the demand for mill-made cloth." And in this question, unfortunately, Lord George Hamilton's will is law. But it would be interesting to learn whether he considers this opinion consistent with the view that the "semblance of protection" afforded by the old duties could enable Indian mills to compete successfully with old-established and more efficient Lancashire looms. But, he argues, though "the "difference was not very substantial, there was "theoretically a case for protection." Why should he then be so eager to avoid all appearance of evil when the interests of Lancashire are threatened, yet insist that before an Indian grievance is remedied it should be proved by practical experience to be capable of working serious mischief? It surely needs no very highly developed sense of equity to perceive the injustice of basing all one's constructive arguments on practice and all one's destructive arguments on theory, or *vice versa*, in such a way as to gain on both aspects of the discussion the benefit of any discrepancy which may exist between theory and fact.

The sentiment about freeing the foreign trade from artificial restrictions by removing the duty from yarns is intended to tickle the ears of Free Traders. But its value cannot be estimated by its conformity with the absolute standard of economic truth. It must be tested by reference solely to the arrangement which it superseded. By that arrangement yarns below 20's were exempt from duty. Now it has never been disputed that Indian cotton is utterly unsuited for yarns of higher counts, and so the exemption of yarns of lower counts left India's export trade of yarns unfettered. How, then, does the supersession of the previous arrangement improve matters? It will hardly be contended that India can re-export to Eastern markets the higher counts imported from Lancashire and compete with direct exports from Lancashire to the East. On no other supposition can the change be reasonably asserted to have benefited India. The true reason for the revision of the tax must be sought not in economic but in political considerations. On this point the manufacturers of India, whom Sir J. Leng quoted, shrewdly divined the truth. The vote of the Lancashire members, combined to claim exemption from the impost levied on all other exporters to India, was sufficient to shake even the present Tory position. On the other hand, it was found impossible in view of India's financial difficulties to fulfil the promises of repeal held out by the Tory party before the General Election. Accordingly, this compromise between necessity and injustice was devised, whereby a sop was given to Lancashire and the loss to the Indian Budget covered by increasing the extent of the incidence of the tax, so as to make it include even the clothes of the very poorest. And this offspring of Lord George Hamilton's ingenuity has actually received the patronage of Sir Henry Fowler, who quoted the speech of the Finance Minister to the effect that the mass of the Indian population would not be called upon to contribute more than half an anna on the average to the new duties, and the very poorest classes probably not more than a pie and a-half. "To speak of this as oppressive taxation," runs the quotation, "is a misuse of words." Surely Sir Henry Fowler has in his youth heard of the fallacy called sorites, and read of Horace's *ruentis acervi*. Or does he not grasp the fact that when the breaking strain of a bar is reached the addition of an ounce will produce an effect apparently quite disproportionate to the weight of the addition. It is impossible to credit him with such ignorance. We can only marvel at his support of a position which necessitates such subterfuges.

Less subtle and not less absurd is Lord George Hamilton's attempt to refute the contention that the 3½ per cent. duties involve the infliction of hardship on the poorest class. His argument is happily described by Sir W. Wedderburn as fantastic. "So "far as Lord George Hamilton is aware there is no "ground for believing that cotton goods woven "from yarns of 20's and under are used exclusively "or nearly exclusively by the poorest classes, "although it is undoubtedly the case that in India, "as in many other countries, the majority of the "population are poor." To take this fantastic argument in detail, in the first place there is an ambiguity in the use of the words "are used ex-"clusively or nearly exclusively." If this means that the lowest counts are used by others than the poorest classes, the assertion is no doubt true, but absolutely beside the question. If on the other hand it means that the poorest classes do not confine themselves, or nearly confine themselves, to the use of the lowest counts, the assertion affects the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

point at issue, indeed, but is a palpable mis-statement. The second part of the *apologia* is at first sight merely the cynical expression of a stupid platitude. Yet even this has its place in the tissue of false arguments and insinuations which has been woven round the question with the effect, if not the intention, of obscuring it. The term "poor" is one that requires definition, and one that is purely relative. No doubt the mass of the population all the world over is poor. But can any civilised country show an average income per head so low as the average income of the natives of India? Can any country in the whole world show a class of labourers so highly taxed in proportion to their income as the Indian rayat? Unless these two conditions are fulfilled, and it is further postulated that the aim of the Indian Government should be not to reach in its administration the highest standard of comfort for the people, but merely not to fall much below the lowest, the implied argument is as valueless as the rest. Lord George Hamilton would hardly confess to himself that he would be satisfied with a success so ignoble. Yet he resorts to arguments which involve such inferences merely in order to defend the amazing scheme which, by a crowning *petitio principii*, he describes as "the equitable "arrangement recently arrived at in connexion with "these duties."

STATE LANDLORDISM IN MADRAS.

WE desire to bring to the notice of all who are interested in the real facts of Indian Administration being laid before the public at home the perfunctory, not to say supercilious, manner in which questions put in Parliament with regard to such facts are answered by the Secretary of State. It will be remembered that on March 19th last Sir W. Wedderburn, on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, put certain questions to the Secretary of State for India, in which, after enquiries whether certain statistics with regard to evictions of tenants of the State, the sale of property of such tenants for much less than its real value, the large area of waste land, etc., and the delay for over three years of the Government of Madras in replying to a reference on the subject, were correct or not, he was asked whether he would cause special enquiry to be made with a view to an improved system of land revenue assessment and collection in the Madras Presidency. Lord G. Hamilton's answer was that he could not trace any reference to Madras evictions in Sir R. Temple's speech on the Indian Budget in 1892, a matter that had also been alluded to in Sir W. Wedderburn's questions. Was it for the purpose of throwing dust into people's eyes that he did not notice the fact of Sir R. Temple's having referred to those evictions in 1894, if he did not in 1892? In acknowledging that his predecessor (he did not say which predecessor, or that this was in the beginning of 1893) had asked the Government of Madras to report whether some improvement could not be introduced in the method of dealing with land revenue defaulters, he stated that that Government was considering the matter and hoped to report shortly, but he omitted to state that its promise to report was made fully a year and a-half ago. He went on to say that he had been able to identify some of the figures in the reports of the Madras Revenue Board, but that others appeared to be incorrect, and he would not trouble the House with remarks on all the figures quoted in the question. With regard to the correctness, we have explained on a former occasion that the only mistakes were made by the printers of the Parliamentary Papers in substituting 5 for 8 in two places, the substance of the questions being unchanged.

Now, the gist of the whole matter lay in the details of those very figures, which went to prove the evils of a system under which, for the realisation of the land revenue, thousands of the tenants of the State were annually evicted from their lands, having to pay interest on overdue instalments in addition to charges for process fees. These figures, taken from the official returns, showed that their property, personal as well as real, was put up to auction and sold for far less than its value, that of the real property thus put up for sale, a very large proportion had to be bought in on account of Government by the revenue

TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF EVICTIONS, ETC., IN MADRAS FROM 1883-4 TO 1893-4.

YEARS.	Total cultivated area in acres.	Total waste in acres.	Total notices of demand.	Total notices of sale.	Total defaulters whose property was sold.	Details of property sold.		Realised by actual sale.		Total number of acres sold.				Total wet and dry.	
						Estimated value of personal property.	Estimated value of real property.	Personal.	Real.	To Government.		To others.			
										Dry.	Irrigated.	Dry.	Irrigated.		
1883-84	19,326,907	...	...	...	130.714	Rs. 362,156	Rs. 464,586	Rs. 272,998	Rs. 480,822	88,167		101,770		189,937	
1884-85	19,438,274	...	...	...	63,610	248,232	206,859	234,586	241,657	34,552		36,433		70,990	366,867
1885-86	27,480,906	8,052,375	...	...	41,833	193,735	219,705	182,201	276,377	28,455		40,183		68,638	
1886-87	27,970,099	7,777,298	...	...	30,915	166,225	1,119,563	146,458	229,335	17,986		19,416		37,402	
1887-88	28,267,292	8,376,156	3,523,309	177,374	35,750	82,302	684,092	90,842	188,906	11,348	2,291	12,027	6,158	31,824	
1888-89	28,773,793	...	4,031,787	144,149	17,346	92,327	715,120	89,752	165,733	10,641	1,783	7,811	3,380	23,615	
1889-90	28,770,031	8,021,292	4,073,688	140,620	11,339	104,621	501,177	96,017	111,085	12,235	1,551	13,678	4,211	31,675	213,867
1890-91	28,878,498	7,869,272	3,983,087	115,934	10,115	67,233	531,837	59,216	119,365	7,711	1,635	9,406	3,018	21,770	
1891-92	28,823,826	7,964,605	4,128,184	156,969	11,118	74,730	512,989	60,899	100,641	7,924	1,715	8,146	2,488	20,273	
1892-93	29,241,343	7,709,658	4,914,683	159,554	12,400	67,742	596,756	58,384	138,552	12,876	1,792	11,636	3,922	30,226	
1893-94	29,597,272	6,992,817	5,374,303	209,517	14,198	83,310	715,612	53,876	155,762	23,470	2,122	24,566	4,326	54,484	
Total...	...	...	...	...	379,338	1,542,613	6,268,296	1,345,229	2,208,235	...	12,889	...	27,503	580,834	
						7,810,909		3,553,464		40,392					

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

authorities for want of bidders at the sales, and that in consequence of this system nearly 3½ millions of acres of assessed land were lying waste. To say the least of it, was it a statesmanlike proceeding to throw the public off the scent of the real object of Sir W. Wedderburn's interrogatories, viz., to expose the radical defects of the Madras land revenue system? We should rather like to know whether the Secretary of State was personally responsible in this matter, or whether his words were put into his mouth by his secretary in the revenue department. He concluded his remarks by saying that the number of evictions had fallen from 130,714 in 1883 to 10,115 in 1890. Was it for the purpose of still further throwing dust into the public eye that he omitted to notice the figures in the second portion of Sir W. Wedderburn's question, which proved that in the three subsequent years the evictions had increased by over 4,000?

As the correctness of the figures in the question had been impugned, Sir W. Wedderburn called for a Parliamentary return, embodying substantially all that he had already given. After delaying to accede to the request for this return for about a month, Lord G. Hamilton stated in the House of Commons that reference would have to be made to Madras before the figures could be made up. That this is not the case, our readers will be satisfied by an inspection of the accompanying statement, prepared from the official records of the India Office and the Indian Statistical Abstract, containing the actual figures asked for in the return. The public may judge for themselves whether a deliberate attempt has not been made to postpone, if not, in view of the dilatoriness of the Madras Government, to stifle enquiry.

MONEY AND THE MOVEMENT OF PRICES.[1]

The issue of 1768 publications on the monetary question between 1871 and 1891—these are the figures given in Dr. Soetbeer's bibliography—is a curious indication of the interest felt in the subject and of the diversity of opinion that it provokes. If all writers were as lucid, and all statisticians as impartial as Mr. Price, the old taunt which makes "statistics" a superlative of which "lies" and "—— lies" are only the positive and comparative, would lose its significance, and we should be brought nearer the solution of some difficult problems. Mr. Price is not in a hurry to prove too much. He understands that the economist really achieves more by being careful to lay sound foundations for others to build upon than by attempting to raise an imposing structure himself. It is not easy to pass such a self-denying ordinance, and, when you have succeeded, it is not pleasant to find that you are called "academic" in consequence, and accused of having more interest in abstractions than in your fellowmen. No little honour is due to those who deliberately set themselves to a task, of which few can appreciate the magnitude or the usefulness, for the sake of the greater ultimate good.

The present little work is the revised form of six lectures delivered by Mr. Price last year as Newmarch Lecturer in Statistics at University College, London. Its object is to determine precisely what the labours of economists have so far proved as to the connexion between the supply of the precious metals and the rise and fall of general prices. That money is not an absolute standard of value, but is itself liable to fluctuations, is a truth less likely to be forgotten now than formerly; the growing divergence between the values of silver and gold, in recent years, has made it abundantly clear. The first chapter describes the attempts made by economists to obtain a more stable standard for the measurement of prices—the "index numbers" of the *Economist* newspaper, of Mr. Palgrave, Sir R. Giffen, Mr. Sauerbeck and Dr. Soetbeer. The second chapter discusses the effect of rising and falling prices on landlords, workmen and employers. The influence of imagination on trade is incidentally shown—"a rise of prices quickens the pace and a fall relaxes the energy"; and the influence of that *vis inertiae*, which retards the effect of changing prices upon wages. Chapter III. investigates the rise of prices consequent on the discovery of America. Prices in England rose from 200 to 300 per cent. in the century that followed. But the question is complicated by the debasement of the currency, which, whilst it tended of itself to increase prices, retarded the influx of the precious metals into England. Chapters IV., V., VI. trace the monetary record of the present century. Here statistics are much fuller, but this very fulness is often bewildering, and the complications of cause and effect are enormously greater. "The growth of industry and commerce, and the interruptions of that growth, the consumption of the metals in the arts, and the drain to the East, are facts of importance, and admit of rough approximate measurement. But the war with France is a factor in the movement of prices, which cannot be neglected; and the suspension of specie payments is an element of the situation, on the precise character and consequences of which an interminable dispute has raged" (p. 105). The difficulties, of course, become greater as the end of the present century is reached. Certain points, however, are clear—*e.g.*, the index numbers of different statisticians agree remarkably in proving a great fall of prices since 1873, and the dislocation of the ratio between silver and gold by the suspension of the free coinage of silver in the Latin states is an admitted fact. As to the effect of the disturbance of this ratio on trade between England and India, Mr. Price remarks:—

> "It was inevitable that either silver prices should rise in India or gold prices fall in England. Some expectations were entertained that the adjustment would be effected by the former process; but there were *a priori* reasons for thinking this unlikely, and the evidence of actual experience has confirmed these reasons. Prices in an Oriental country, where custom is powerful, and the spirit of business enterprise inelastic, are rigid when compared with the rapid movement and constant stir of the industrial and commercial economy of Western Europe. If, therefore, a readjustment in relative prices becomes inevitable, it is more likely to be effected in the country, where the *vis inertiae* resisting change is weaker. . . .

[1] "Money and its Relations to Prices: being an Inquiry into the Causes, Measurement and Effects of Changes in General Prices." By L. L. PRICE, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

This *a priori* probability has been confirmed by actual experience. Until recently prices in India, which were silver prices, had not risen; and prices in England, which were gold prices, had fallen."

Mr. Price's general conclusion is that "it is impossible to doubt that the fall of prices shown by the index number is connected with monetary changes," and that this fall of prices has operated to some extent as a check to material prosperity. The whole book bears evidence of the most careful research and of the writer's earnest endeavour after strict impartiality.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

"INDIA MUST BE BLED."

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

We discuss elsewhere the proposal of the British Government to charge upon the Indian revenues the "ordinary" expenses of Indian troops despatched to the Sudan. The subject has attracted a good deal of attention—and, on the whole, remarkably friendly attention—in the British press. We give below a series of typical opinions which will doubtless be read with interest in India.

"A GRAVE INJUSTICE."

The *Daily News* wrote on May 13th:—The questions put and the answers given in the House of Commons yesterday on the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan are a curious study. They show, in the first place, that there has been little or no communication between Cabinet Ministers on a very serious subject, and, in the second place, that Mr. Balfour will not listen to his colleagues when he is sitting on the same bench with them. Sir Charles Dilke asked the Secretary of State for India whether the necessary motion would be made in the House for authority to charge the expenses of this force upon the revenues of India. Lord George Hamilton replied in vague language, which was understood to mean that in his valuable opinion no such Parliamentary sanction would be required. Sir Charles Dilke reminded him that a directly opposite opinion had been expressed eleven years ago by the late Mr. Cross, then Under-Secretary for India, who moved and carried the resolution declared by Lord George to be superfluous. The circumstances were almost precisely similar, the destination of the troops being then, as now, the Sudan, and Lord Hartington had done the same thing in 1882. But Lord George Hamilton had forgotten all about it, and did not even know to what Sir Charles Dilke referred. Finding Lord George hopeless, the Opposition gave him up as a bad job, and tried the First Lord of the Treasury. Mr. Balfour took a view totally different from the view of Lord George Hamilton. He admitted at once that if there were any charge upon the revenues of India the House must give its assent and promised a day for the purpose. The compliance of the House, it may be observed, is equally essential whether the draft upon India's resources is refunded from the British Exchequer or not. There will thus be a full opportunity for discussing the policy of sending these troops, and the objects for which they are sent. Perhaps, before that time, the Cabinet will have met, and arrived at some understanding. But if the people of India are made to pay for this expedition, or for any part of it, a grave injustice will be inflicted upon them.

"AN OUTRAGE."

The *Daily Chronicle* (May 12th) wrote:—The news that Indian troops are to occupy Suakin looks very different from two different points of view. Since we are plunged into this expedition—this war, we may say—it is obviously desirable that it should be brought to a successful close as quickly, as efficiently, as cheaply as possible, and with the least sacrifice of life. Therefore, since Indian troops are much better fitted to act in the climate of the Red Sea than British troops, and since they can be ready for despatch in a week, and are not required elsewhere at the present time, it seems wise, from the mere military point of view, to employ them. But to place the extra expense of their co-operation upon India would be an outrage. We certainly understood that the Government had already stated that the cost of the Sudan war would be borne by Egypt. If not, then certainly the Imperial Government must pay for it. India is only concerned with Egypt as the Cape, the Australian colonies, and the Far Eastern colonies are concerned, and if India should pay, then Australia and Hong Kong should also bear a direct share. Which is absurd. The British Government has undertaken the war, and the British taxpayer will have to pay every bill that Egypt leaves unpaid.

"SPONGING ON THE INDIGENT TAXPAYERS OF INDIA."

The *Manchester Guardian* (May 13th) wrote: The Government would do better to say at once whether it intends to sponge on the indigent taxpayers of India for part of the costs of the Sudan expedition. There was more beating about the bush at question time in the House of Commons yesterday. Indian troops, it is known, are to be used at Suakin. But when the Government is asked whether the Indian or the Imperial Exchequer is to defray the additional expense of their employment outside India, it replies that it really does not know. Perhaps the British taxpayer will pay, perhaps the Indian, perhaps the Egyptian. It is equally discreditable to the Government whether this ignorance of its own intentions is sincere or simulated. If it be sincere, then the Government really thinks it might be defensible to burden the Indian taxpayers with part of the cost of an expedition with which India has no more concern than Australia, and—if all that is rumoured be true—far less concern than the British colonies in Africa. To do this would be to adopt the infatuated Spanish policy of stimulating disaffection in weak colonial dependencies by extorting money from them in relief of home taxation. For if the Indian taxpayer does not pay, then the British taxpayer must do so. The money that Egypt has by her to be

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

spent on this adventure must already be almost gone, the prospective bill is growing larger every day, and it must be footed either by India or by the United Kingdom. The former alternative would be more profitable to the Government as the heads of a party. If they adopted it they could gratify with a serious but comparatively cheap war the diffused appetite for national excitement which is the curse of the country. But the offence committed against the poor and helpless peoples of India would be monstrous. By the elaborate system of "Home Charges" for the Indian army these peoples are now paying a part of the cost of the garrisons of Great Britain and Ireland. While the Imperial Government did not venture to ask the colonies for a contribution to the cost of building the Colonial Office, it made India pay the whole cost of the vastly more expensive India Office. Even these are not such reliefs from taxation as a citizen of this country who keeps up some ideal of a duty towards India can accept with complacency. But it would be much more humiliating if it were felt that the taxes on the food of millions of half-starved peasants in Madras were to be raised in order that this rich empire might make new conquests in the interior of Africa for nothing. It is only charitable to suppose that the Government has already made up its mind not to increase the ordinary Indian contribution to the maintenance of the troops now to be brought to Suakin. In that case the shilly-shallying of Lord George Hamilton, Mr. Balfour, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach during the last two days only indicates a desire to break slowly to taxpayers in the United Kingdom the news that the Budget forecast of expenditure was fallacious, and that a heavy bill for warfare in the Sudan will probably have to be paid by new taxation next April.

Ministerial Levity and Nescience.

The *Star* (May 14th) wrote:—The cross-examination of the Treasury Bench by Mr. Morley, Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Labouchere upon the expenses of the Indian troops in the Sudan has, at any rate, served to show how lightly responsible Ministers regard a question which is of vital importance to our reputation, and therefore to our authority, in India. Lord George Hamilton's replies, in particular, have displayed an ignorance which in any other member of the House of Commons would have been remarkable. The question raised is really threefold: (*a*) Who is going to pay for the Indian troops sent to the Sudan; (*b*) if India is to bear a part of the charge, will the assent of Parliament be duly obtained; and (*c*) will a resolution be submitted to Parliament, even though no part of the charge is to be borne by India? As to (*a*), Lord George Hamilton stated categorically on Monday that the expense would be apportioned between the Government of India and our own Government. Mr. Balfour corrected him, and explained that the Government of Egypt would also contribute a part. As to (*c*), Lord George Hamilton stated, and reiterated the statement, that if India made no contribution, no resolution need be submitted. Mr. Balfour has since corrected him, and admitted, as he was bound to do, that the precedents are all the other way. As to (*b*), there is no possibility of doubt or misunderstanding. It is clearly laid down in the Act of 1858 that, except in cases of emergency, Indian troops cannot be employed beyond the frontiers of India, at the expense of the Indian revenues, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament. Unless we are to assume that Lord George Hamilton was wrong at every point, India will bear a part of the charge. Yet the consent of Parliament has not been obtained, and the subject would not have been brought forward at all but for the zeal of members of the Opposition. It is now certain that a resolution will be submitted, and will, of course, be approved by the Government's machine-made majority. But what in the world has India to do with the Sudan, and why in the world should her poverty-stricken taxpayers pay a penny, or an anna, of the cost? When Lord Salisbury was Secretary of State for India, he said that the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf. The House of Commons needs to be constantly watchful of Lord Salisbury, who, as Prime Minister, said the other day that the Sudan expedition was undertaken in the interests of Egypt, while his Government intends that it shall be carried on at the expense of India. Unfortunately, the precedents are on the side of fleecing India for military operations with which she has no concern. Here is a catalogue showing the various occasions on which the British Government has borrowed troops from India:—

1859-60	China Expedition.
1860 and 1861	New Zealand.
1867	Abyssinian Expedition.
1875	Perak Expedition.
1878	Strengthening Malta.
1878	The Afghan War.
1882	Egypt.
1885	Sudan Expedition.

The loan of troops would, to begin with, have been impossible if we had not imposed upon India an army far larger than she needs, and more costly than she can afford. But not only has our Government compelled the people of India to maintain an excessively large army: it has also compelled them to bear the expense of troops removed from India for British operations. In the Afghan War and in the Egyptian Expedition the British Government threw the whole expense upon India, save for a contribution of £5,000,000 in one case and £500,000 in the other. In the China Expedition and the reinforcement of Malta we actually had the grace to pay the expenses of the troops we had borrowed, but in all the other cases, though the troops were moved from India, and India was deprived of their services, India paid the "ordinary" expenses. There can be little doubt that, in the present instance, this indescribably shabby policy will be pursued. Yet we plume ourselves—or, rather, Mr. Balfour and his friends plume themselves—upon our "prestige," and chatter about our "moral influence" in India. What hypocrisy it must all seem, to be sure, to the educated Indian, especially as it is only the pinch of the cotton duties that produces any doubts or enquiries in this country as to whether we are really treating India fairly. We are glad to see that Mr.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

John Morley has put his shoulder to this wheel. May we hope that he will sift the Indian question as he has sifted the Irish question?

THE "SPECTATOR" APPROVES.

The *Spectator* of May 16th, in an article upon "The Formidableness of England," wrote: It is not a fortnight since the decision was taken to garrison Suakin from India, and already the regiments, foot, cavalry, artillery, Intelligence Department, engineers, and, we doubt not, all materials for telegraphs, if not for a short railway, are on their road to the Red Sea. A fortnight's longer notice, and the division could have been made an army corps; a month's, and a fully equipped army would have been on board the transports. They are among the best troops in the world, too—English soldiers annealed by what is practically foreign service, and Sikhs who have fought successfully with Englishmen, and who regard a summons to fight in Egypt or Burmah or China as a summons to a rollicking adventure, during which they can gratify their thirst for fighting and save the whole of their regular pay. When it is remembered that the Continent does not perceive accurately the limits of our power of recruiting, and does perceive that there are scarcely any limits to our power of spending, it is hardly wonderful that it should watch the movements of a State thus armed with a certain sleeplessness of suspicion. The English could do such terrible things if they would, and they do grab so much. We are not writing this because we object in any way to the despatch of Indian troops to the Red Sea. It is perfectly fair, if we have a plan to carry out on the Nile, that our magnificent ally, whom we help whenever she is in difficulty, should help us in return. India pays for her Army, but she does no pay for our Fleet, and it is our Fleet and not her Army which saves her from the invasions which, if we lost the command of the sea, would in three years destroy at once her commercial prosperity and her immunity from internal disorder. She ought not to pay extra money for a project which is ours, but it is perfectly fair that she should pay the wages and expenses which she would pay if the troops were at home. Her garrison is not the feebler but the stronger for a spell of foreign work, which reveals and cures defects of equipment, which binds officers and men together as nothing else does, and which, above all, gives the fighting races, Sikhs, and Pathans, and Mahrattas, an outlet for their inborn military spirit. There is no education for soldiers like a well-managed expedition, more especially if they are men who enjoy it, and if they belong to races which tend to despondency and fat if they never have anything to do. We think it quite fine if Canadian or Australian regiments volunteer to help us, and not to mention that every native soldier is a volunteer, who enlists uncompelled even by "the stern conscription of hunger," among the Sikhs and Pathans at all events, a call for volunteers would be answered by entire regiments stepping to the front. They love the excitement of campaigning, which to them seems life. It is nonsense to talk of "mercenaries" in an empire a hundred years old. It is as much their interest while the empire lasts that it should succeed in war as it is ours, and provided there is no conscription, we see no more moral objection to calling on her Majesty's Indian than on her Majesty's British or Irish subjects to fight on her behalf.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF PARLIAMENT.

The *Manchester Guardian* said on May 15th:—At every new step taken in the Sudan enterprise one wonders whether the Government is really in two minds about it or whether it is out of policy that it speaks with two tongues. This week it has given a fresh exhibition of perplexity or of shuffling, whichever it is to be called. On Monday it was known that Indian troops were to be brought to Suakin, an intention carefully unannounced in the war programme of last March. The Government was at once asked who was to pay for them and when the usual authorising resolution would be submitted to the House. The answers were as ambiguous as Mr. Curzon's mutually contradictory statements of the objects of the expedition itself. As to the expenses of the Indian draft, Lord George Hamilton said that the apportionment of the cost between the Indian and Imperial Exchequers was still under consideration. Was it to be understood, then, somebody asked, that the expense of these troops was not to be borne by the Egyptian Government? "No," Sir Michael Hicks-Beach replied at once; "not at all." So that according to Lord George Hamilton the expense is to be divided between India and the United Kingdom, and according to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach it is not to be understood that the expense will not be borne by Egypt. Within the same five minutes in which these two explanations were offered, Mr. Balfour offered a third—that the expense would be divided between all the three Governments. One might suppose that the subject of Egypt was tabooed at Cabinet Councils, and that Ministers trusted to their ingenuity to knock up some sort of Egyptian policy between them after coming down to the House. There is the same haziness, to say the least of it, in their answers to questions about the authorising resolution. One member of the Cabinet, it is known, has published very strong views on the question. This is the Duke of Devonshire. But his colleagues contradict him and each other without hesitation. On Monday Sir Michael Hicks-Beach practically told the House that the Act of Parliament required a resolution authorising the use of the Indian troops to be submitted to the House if the ordinary expenses of those troops when serving outside India were to be charged to the Indian Government. On Tuesday Mr. Balfour said that,

> "in point of actual law there was no obligation to have the consent of Parliament unless some extra charge was thrown upon Indian finance."

Now what is to be gathered from all these authoritative explanations? First, that when India only bears the ordinary expense of the use of Indian troops outside India, the authority of Parliament is required for their use. Secondly, that it is not required. Thirdly, that the expense of their employment in this instance is to be divided between the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

United Kingdom and India. Fourthly, that it is not to be supposed that this expense will not be borne by Egypt. Fifthly, that this expense will be divided between all three.

Lord George Hamilton is to make a further statement to-night, and Mr. Balfour, adhering to his new practice of arranging one part of the Session's work so as to bribe the House to scamp another, promised that the first Parliamentary day after the Agricultural Rating Bill had passed the Committee stage should be given up to a discussion of the subject. By assuming this air of concession Mr. Balfour puts the subject in a false light. It is not a case in which the Opposition should be left to invite or force a discussion. If the Government did not throw all precedent aside, Lord George Hamilton would give notice to-day of a motion relating to the employment of the Indian troops, and it would be discussed without a day's unnecessary delay. The chief case in point occurred on July 31st, 1882. Then, as now, it had been determined to use Indian troops for Egyptian service. It was not yet determined, just as it is apparently not yet determined by the present Cabinet, in what proportions the Imperial and the Indian Exchequer should contribute to the expenses of their employment. Nevertheless, the Duke of Devonshire, then, of course, Lord Hartington, proposed a resolution giving the consent of the House to the charging of the Indian revenues with some undefined contribution to the expenses. The opening sentences of the Duke of Devonshire's speech are worth remembering:

"The purpose," he said, "with which the resolution is moved is not mainly, nor yet all, of a financial character, but is rather of a political and a constitutional character. The necessity of moving this resolution is defined in the 55th section of the Act for the Government of India. That section has been the subject from time to time of a good deal of controversy. But for this section it would be possible—I do not say it would be probable, but it was conceivable—that the Government might carry on military operations through the agency of the Government of India, by means of the troops maintained on the Indian establishment and charged on the Indian revenues, without the consent of Parliament at all. I do not say that such a case is probable, but it is not only to prevent such a contingency that the section was framed. It also reserves to Parliament the power of deciding on the question whether, in case of an operation or a policy which has been essentially and in principle decided on by Parliament, whether such a policy may be carried out by the agency of Indian troops, or only by the agency of troops on the British establishment."

The Duke of Devonshire's declaration is in letter, and still more in spirit, absolutely opposed to Mr. Balfour's. Mr. Balfour treats the resort to Parliament for an authorising resolution as a matter of merely formal consequence. The Duke of Devonshire enters thoroughly into the meaning of the regulating Act, and shows that it was intended not merely to control the apportionment of certain military expenditure, but to give Parliament the power of deciding in what circumstances Indian troops might properly be employed outside India. The policy of the present Government is, first, to employ Indian troops at its own discretion for military operations in which India has no interest, or at most an interest so extremely remote as to be not worth mentioning. It then refuses to make any definite statement of the proposed financial arrangements, and tells the House of Commons that this piece of neglect on the part of the Government deprives Parliament of its constitutional right to judge of the propriety of the use to which Indian troops are being put. Finally, Mr. Balfour says in a casual fashion that the House will be allowed to discuss the matter. He is so good as to say that, since it seems to be the custom, the Government will not contravene the Act for the Government of India. Still it is to be understood that the requirements of that Act cannot be satisfied until a party measure for the benefit of one class of the Government's supporters has been forced through Committee.

There are two points upon which independent members of the House must insist. First, there is the point emphasised by the Duke of Devonshire in 1882. It is the right and duty of Parliament to control the employment of Indian troops outside India—not merely to say how the expenses of such employment shall be defrayed, but on what occasions it shall be permitted. For many years our Governments have been sliding into a practice of treating the employment of the Indian army for foreign service as a matter in which Parliament has no voice or merely a formal voice. That was not the intention of the Act and the intentions of the Act must be made plain. In the second place there must be at least a vigorous protest against any inclination on the Government's part to sponge on the Indian taxes for the relief of taxpayers at home. In this adventure in the Sudan, India has practically no interest whatever. It may be said that India is a part of the Empire and that every limb has an interest in the body. But then Canada has an equal interest, and so has New Zealand, and the Cape Colony has in this case an interest less remote. Yet the Government would never dream of making Canada or Australia or the South African colonies contribute to the cost. India is brought into the matter simply and solely because she contains a standing army that can be used, and because from the form of her Government that army is practically at the disposal of the Cabinet. But the Indian army is there for the good of India. It is maintained to protect her from foreign invasion and from internal disorder. That is the only theory which justifies the imposition of its whole cost on the country itself—it keeps India safe, and therefore India must pay for it. But now, in order that England may prosecute "the reclamation of the Sudan from barbarism" and other apostolic schemes with which India has no concern, India is for a time to be deprived of a portion of that force which Anglo-Indian experts constantly declare to be the very minimum necessary for her safety. Reason and fairness suggest that for such a sacrifice she should be paid, not that she should herself pay for having to make it. Perfect equity lays it down that since India, according to the accepted theory, only pays for her army because it gives her protection, she should not pay for it, or for a part of it, during any period for which the protection offered by its presence is withdrawn. While any portion of the Indian army is employed in the Sudan enterprise, the relation towards India which alone justifies the charging of India with its

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

cost is suspended so far as this portion is concerned. It becomes to all intents and purposes a portion of the ordinary British army, employed on non-Indian service, and not justly chargeable on the Indian taxes. Justice would only be perfectly satisfied if, in the first place, India were relieved for the time of a charge for which during that time she receives no return; and if, in the second place, she received some equivalent for the temporary impairing of her security. This last equivalent, we fear, she need not hope for, and there is only too little chance that in this instance she will be relieved of the "ordinary" charges for the troops absent in Africa. While they are garrisoning Suakin, or advancing from it into the desert, India will probably contribute to their maintenance at least as much as if they were patrolling the north-west frontier of India or keeping down dacoity in Burma. That is how India has been regularly treated in the past, but there is no reason why a strong protest should not be made against an arrangement clearly inequitable, no matter how many precedents there may be for it. Still more necessary is it that injustice should not go further, as it has often done before, and that the Indian taxpayers should not be actually burdened with any part of the excessive cost of the employment of Indian troops in African warfare, over and above the sum which they would have cost if they had remained in the ordinary service of India. It is bad enough that India should be deprived, perhaps for a long time, of a part of her normal protection; worse still that she should continue to pay for it at the same rate while it is withheld from her; worst of all that she should pay even more for having it withheld than for enjoying the benefit of it.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

RELIEF FOR THE RICH: BURDENS FOR THE POOR.

LORD G. HAMILTON AND THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

Under the heading, "The Cotton Duties and the Indian Poor," the following correspondence between the Indian Parliamentary Committee and the Secretary of State for India was circulated on May 7th to members of Parliament, the Press and others, "for the purpose of bringing to their notice the strong objections taken by Indian public opinion to the recent rearrangement of the cotton duties."

"It is contended," wrote Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. J. Herbert Roberts in the paragraph introducing the correspondence, "that the effect of this rearrangement, unless disallowed by the Secretary of State, will be to lighten considerably the taxation falling on the richer classes in India, while adding to the taxation upon the poorest classes, who already bear an excessive share of the public burdens."

To the Right Honourable
LORD GEORGE FRANCIS HAMILTON, M.P.,
Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for India,
India Office, Whitehall, S.W.

My Lord,—At the request of the Indian Parliamentary Committee I have the honour to submit to you certain considerations in favour of modifying in one particular the re-arrangement of the cotton duties recently adopted by the Indian Government.

2. The modification is simply this: that the Government of India should be directed to exempt, by Executive orders, from all duty, whether excise or import, all cloths, whether Indian made or imported, into whose composition no yarns of a higher count than 20s enter.

3. The main grounds of this recommendation are four:

(1) That the suggested remission of tax upon the coarser cloth will give relief to the extent of 10½ lakhs to the poorest classes, already depressed by a 4,000 per cent. duty on the salt they consume (viz., 2 rs. 8 annas per maund on what costs only 1 anna to produce); and that it will give universal satisfaction throughout India, thereby affording great moral support to our administration.

(2) That the recent imposition of 10½ lakhs of taxation upon the coarser cloth is especially open to objection on the present occasion because the rest of the re-arrangement involved the remission of 37 lakhs (or, if the duty on fine yarns be added, 51 lakhs) of taxation, hitherto paid by the less needy classes.

(3) That the sole original ground for imposing excise duty was to prevent the import duty operating protectively. But the 3½ per cent. excise recently imposed on the coarser cloth operates protectively in a high degree, inasmuch as Bombay and Manchester together supply at most two-fifths of the Indian consumption of such cloth, while three-fifths are produced by mills in Native States and by hand looms throughout India; thus two-fifths will be taxed and three-fifths escape taxation.

Incidentally it may be noted that this excise duty will distinctly encourage British subjects to start new mills in Native States, and so deprive the population of British India of employment which they would have otherwise obtained from the further development of this industry.

(4) That in many parts of India definite attempts are being made to organise a boycott of English cloth. As the ground of preaching this boycott is an alleged injustice to India by the Government in favour of Lancashire, such a movement is undesirable, if not actually dangerous, from a political point of view.

4. So far as the Committee are aware only three objections can be raised to the modification recommended.

(1) That it will involve some loss of revenue. It is true that it will involve a loss of possibly 18½ lakhs of *estimated* revenue, but of this 10½ lakhs will be *new* taxation on the poorest classes imposed by this re-arrangement.

(2) That it is impossible, if any line be drawn by counts, to deal equitably with all cloths. It may be at once conceded that if it were intended to tax cloths proportionally to the amount of higher count yarns that they contain, it would, as has long ago been discovered, be enormously difficult. But it is only proposed that cloths containing no higher counts than 20s should be exempt, all others,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

whether they contain one-tenth or nine-tenths of higher count yarns, remaining liable to taxation, and this rule can be carried out in practice without any serious difficulty. If, however, it be argued that it is unjust that cloth which contains only a small proportion of higher count yarns should pay as much as one entirely composed of these, the answer simply is, that the rule being publicly laid down, it is the manufacturer's own fault if, by using any higher count in his web, he renders it dutiable.

(3) That the exemption of coarser goods may lead to their substitution in consumption for our finer qualities of cloth. No one who knows India, however, will endorse this purely hypothetical objection. Even in England such a substitution would not be easily effected; and in India, where custom has so strong a hold upon the people, a change of this kind would be practically impossible.

5. Trusting that you will give favourable consideration to the points above set forth,

I have the honour to be, my Lord,
Your obedient servant,
W. WEDDERBURN,
Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee.

21*st April*, 1896.

India Office, 5*th May*, 1896.

Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.

Sir,—I am directed by Lord George Hamilton to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated the 29th April, 1896, in which you show cause against the recent readjustment of the Indian cotton duties, and you recommend that the Government of India should be directed to exempt from import or excise duty all cotton cloths containing no yarns of higher counts than 20s.

The recent revision of the cotton duties was undertaken in order to redeem the pledges given by the late and present Government that those duties should not be retained in a shape that gave a fiscal advantage to goods made at Indian mills as compared with similar goods imported from the United Kingdom. In the Parliamentary return which will shortly be ready for distribution will be found detailed statements regarding the protective character of the duties imposed in December, 1894; and it was practically admitted that, though there were differences of opinion as to the extent of the protection conferred on Indian-made goods by the legislation of 1894, there was an element of protection in the legislation recently imposed.

The legislation of 1894 had imposed a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on all imported yarns and woven goods, and also an excise duty on all yarns of counts above 20s made at Indian mills. The experience of 1879-80 had shown that an artificial line drawn for fiscal purposes between certain classes of woven goods operated injuriously both on the trade and on the revenue. The bulk of the produce of Indian mills (see page 8 of Parliamentary Paper, No. 7602 of 1895)—more than 80 per cent.—consists of yarns, and less than 20 per cent. consists of woven goods; while at the same time there were signs of an increase in the importation of British yarns. Any duties that were imposed or retained would in the end fall upon the consumer; and it was considered the best way of relieving the trade (Indian as well as foreign) from artificial restrictions, of diminishing the burdens on the consumer, and of excluding all semblance of protection, would be to make all yarns altogether free of duty, and to place a duty on all woven goods. At the same time it was decided to reduce the rate of cotton duties from 5 per cent. to 3½ per cent. *ad valorem*.

It is difficult to see how, if any cotton duties yielding about Rx. 1,000,000 a year were necessary, there could have been fuller simplification of the tariff, or how all protective element could have been more completely eliminated. It is certainly the case that goods made at Indian mills will now bear a larger proportionate share of the duties than they did under the legislation of 1894; but it is acknowledged that under the earlier Act such goods were more or less protected, and the later legislation was undertaken mainly to eliminate all such protective element.

In regard to the special objections you urge against the recent arrangement, I am to say that, so far as Lord George Hamilton is aware, there is no ground for believing that cotton goods woven from yarns of 20s and under are used exclusively, or nearly exclusively, by the poorest classes, though it is undoubtedly the case that in India, as in many other countries, the majority of the population are poor. Lord George Hamilton does not share the expectation that the 3½ per cent. duty on mill-woven goods will enable hand-looms to compete successfully with power mills, or to reduce the demand for mill-made cloth.

The possible competition of mills in Native States cannot at present be a serious factor in the problem. According to the latest returns—"Indian Commercial Statistics," vol. of 1896, pp. 374-379—there were in the Native States, Berar, and the French Settlements of India, 9 cotton mills, containing 1,613 looms, as compared with 127 mills containing 27,749 looms in British India. If hereafter competition from Mills in Native States should become serious, the law (Act II of 1896, section 37) gives the Government power to levy duties on such goods as may enter British India from Native States.

For these conclusive reasons Lord George Hamilton cannot disturb the equitable arrangement recently arrived at in connection with these duties.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
G. W. E. LODER.

THE MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

THE OFFICIAL RECORD.

The following record of the motion for adjournment appears in the "Votes and Proceedings" of the House of Commons for May 18th:—

68. Adjournment.—Sir William Wedderburn, member for Banffshire, rose in his place and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the effect of the Indian

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

cotton duties as recently rearranged, which increase the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of Indian consumers"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than 40 members having accordingly risen,

Motion made and question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn" (Sir William Wedderburn).

After debate thereon, Mr. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the question be now put"; but Mr. Speaker withheld his assent, because it appeared to him that the House was prepared shortly to come to a decision without that motion. Debate resumed; motion, by leave, withdrawn.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

THE "DAILY NEWS."

The *Daily News* wrote (May 19th): There is something to be said for Sir Henry Fowler's complaint that a motion for the adjournment of the House of Commons, such as Sir William Wedderburn made yesterday afternoon, is not the best way of discussing such a difficult and complicated subject as the Indian cotton duties. But that the Secretary of State for India should protest against it is really too absurd. For no one took a more prominent part than Lord George Hamilton in a similar debate raised in precisely the same manner at the beginning of last year. Sir William Wedderburn's case is simple enough. He argues that the duties as revised by the present Government take forty lakhs of rupees off the finer cloths which are used by the rich, and put ten lakhs on the coarses cloths which are worn by the poor. Lord George Hamilton says that the finer cloths are worn by the poor and the coarser cloths by the rich, which seems odd. Before Sir Henry Fowler left office he gave a pledge that if the duties were shown to be in any way protective he would modify them, so as to remove the element of protection. Lord George Hamilton, however, has completely changed the nature and incidence of the tax. In hope of conciliating Lancashire, which, so far as Mr. George Whiteley is concerned, has not been conciliated, he sacrificed a large amount of Indian revenue, and balanced this injury by exempting the products of the native hand looms. The objection to this policy is twofold. It cannot be reconciled either with the interests of India or with the doctrines of free trade. There has been considerable agitation in India against the new duties, though Lord George declares that it has not died out. Lancashire, in spite of Mr. Whiteley, has been more silent, probably hoping that the duties will be repealed next year. The subject will be more fully discussed on the Indian Budget, if there is anyone left to discuss it when the Indian Budget comes on.

THE "MANCHESTER GUARDIAN."

The *Manchester Guardian* wrote:—One good result of the discussion on the Indian import and excise duties on cotton goods raised in the House of Commons yesterday by Sir William Wedderburn is the promise that an early opportunity will be given for a full consideration of the Indian Budget. It may also be hoped that the reopening of the question will tend to stimulate the interest of the House in Indian affairs, and put an end to the indifference to questions affecting the government and the finances of our great dependency which in former years has been nothing less than a scandal. For the rest, the case presented by Sir William Wedderburn is quite out of date, and really never had in it anything worth serious consideration. He appears to be under the impression that the excise duty of 3½ per cent. imposed on coarse cloths produced in the Bombay and other mills in India, as the equivalent of a similar duty on all imported cloths, is specially felt as a hardship by the poorer classes in India, and that this assumption is proved to be a fact by the threat to "boycott" Lancashire goods, of which something was heard some time ago. Of course Lancashire would be very glad to see both Indian excise and import duties on cotton cloths abolished; they are alike objectionable from every point of view, and it is to be hoped that the promised discussion on the Indian Budget will demonstrate not only that they are mischievous, but that they are unnecessary. But to those who are familiar with all the facts of the case it seems difficult to believe that Sir William Wedderburn was even serious in the arguments which he put forward. If there is one thing more certain than another it is that the whole "boycotting" agitation—of which nothing has been heard for several mails past—was the mere threat of a number of interested mill managers, agents, and shareholders, who naturally desire to escape, if possible, the payment of a tax of 3½ per cent. on anything. The discussion had, however, in addition to drawing attention to the duty of the House with regard to the Indian Budget, the good effect of enabling the Secretary of State for India to expose, once for all, the fallacy that imported Lancashire goods are consumed only by the well-to-do classes. In connection with the attempts made in various quarters to justify protection for the Bombay mills, there has been more nonsense uttered on this point than on any other. The existing system of duties is not everything that could be desired, but, in view of all the circumstances, it is probably the best compromise that could be arrived at, short of the entire abolition of what must in any case be vexatious imposts.

THE "TIMES."

The *Times* said:—Sir William Wedderburn thought it opportune and advantageous to move the adjournment of the House, after question time, in order to call attention to the alleged dissatisfaction in India caused by the recent rearrangement of the cotton duties. The motion was supported by almost the whole of the Opposition, except the occupants of the front bench, and a couple of hours were spent in a purposeless and mischievous debate. Lord George Hamilton's defence of his action against the censures of Sir William Wedderburn and of Sir John Leng appears to be complete. He demonstrated conclusively that the adoption of the plan of exempting

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

from both excise and import duties all the coarser counts of manufactured cottons would knock away the keystone from the policy that has just been tried. But the strongest objection to raising the question in the way in which Sir William Wedderburn raised it were urged by Sir Henry Fowler. The late Secretary for India said that he was willing to defend his own conduct, and, when necessary, to criticise his successor's measures, at the proper time. But it was not right, he contended, to spring such a motion on the House, practically without notice, when members had not had time to read the Blue-book that had just appeared. The intervention attempted was not only premature and inconclusive, but calculated to create a dangerous disturbance of feeling in India, without any possibility of benefit to our Indian fellow-subjects. Sir Henry Fowler's refusal to allow Indian affairs to be dragged into the vortex of party politics is greatly to his credit, and is an example which both sides ought to keep before them.

The writer of the Parliamentary sketch in the *Daily Chronicle* said: To fulfil their pledges to Lancashire the Government have put a tax on the cottons made in India—the coarse cottons used by the poorest of the people; and Sir William Wedderburn—the best friend India has in the House—voiced the Indian native protest against this action. The subject is possibly complicated to English ears, and Sir Willian Wedderburn sprang it suddenly on the House, with the result of a very poor and inadequate debate. Sir Henry Fowler showed an almost excessive annoyance at Sir William's precipitancy, finally persuading him to withdraw his motion without a division. Lord George Hamilton seized the opportunity to prove that he had fulfilled his promise to the people of Lancashire. The debate was undoubtedly somewhat premature, and should have been planned more carefully; but the development of the business will require to be keenly watched by the Opposition. It looks as if the Governments of England and India were striking a bargain which will satisfy both themselves and the Manchester merchants, while it places yet another tax of a hateful and oppressive kind on the people of India. The countervailing duty on the Indian cheap cottons is to compensate the Manchester merchant for the custom duty on his imported cottons.

The *Liverpool Daily Post* (May 8th) wrote: From the correspondence that has passed between Sir W. Wedderburn and Lord George Hamilton, it is evident that the Government's tinkering with the Indian Cotton Duties, in order to redeem electioneering pledges, has not produced satisfactory results in India. Sir H. Fowler did his best to establish absolutely equal treatment between the Indian and the Lancashire cotton trade, but Lord George Hamilton thought he could do better. There was, he says, an element of Protection in Sir H. Fowler's scheme of Customs and Excise Duties, and he wished to eliminate this objectionable feature. We have no liking for Protection in any form, not even by paying rates for people who are quite capable of paying them themselves, and if there was really a Protective element in Sir H. Fowler's Indian Cotton Duties it was very desirable that it should be removed. But it should not be removed by creating a greater evil, and this, unfortunately, is what Lord George Hamilton has done. And he has not only created a greater evil, but he has not eliminated the Protective element. His new duty still leaves the produce of native hand looms untaxed, and of the coarse cloths that are in question three-fifths are the produce of these looms. But this is not the real evil of the new duty. The serious and lamentable feature of the change that Lord George Hamilton has made is that he has taken 51 lakhs of taxation off the more comfortable classes in India, and has put 10½ lakhs of new taxation on the very poor. The finances of India are fortunately in a better condition than when Sir H. Fowler was compelled to sanction the cotton duties, and it would have been gratifying on all sides if Lord George Hamilton could have reduced, still better if he could have abolished them. He has reduced them, but for every £1 he has taken off the richer classes he has put a new tax of 4s. on the poor, who already pay a tax of 40 per cent. on salt, which in India is an indispensable article of consumption. This is the evil which Sir W. Wedderburn wishes to have removed, but Lord George Hamilton is so inflexible a Free Trader that he prefers to relieve the rich at the cost of the poor, rather than leave open to Protection a chink so small that it could scarcely squeeze in a little finger.

Reviews.

THE SPOILS OF WAR.

Indian and Oriental Armour. By the Right Hon. LORD EGERTON OF TATTON, M.A., etc. New edition, enlarged. (London: W. H. Allen and Co.)

Even to the uninitiated the diversity of form and decoration exhibited by the weapons, offensive and defensive, collected from India at various times, brings home the essential complexity of the nations grouped together for convenient reference under the term Indian people. The Indian peninsula has been the scene of some of the most tremendous and stirring conflicts in the world's history. From early times its wealth was proverbial, exaggerated no doubt by its distance from western civilisation and the difficulties of access. But no consideration of the obstacles in their path prevented the warlike races of the west from endeavouring to secure for themselves some portion of this untold wealth, and a series of invasions took place, the earliest of which is assigned by a not altogether incredible tradition to two thousand years before the Christian era. This and yet another legendary invasion proceeded from Egypt. When the Persian Empire had succeeded the decline of the power of Egypt, the new rulers of Western Asia conquered and made tributary the provinces on the Indus. But the Persian power, in its turn, broke on the barriers of Hellenic civilisation, and made room for the great Macedonian conqueror, who in the fourth century overran the peninsula, and established relations between the eastern and western world, which provided stores of information about lands hitherto peopled by the shadowy figments of popular fancy. The cautious Romans, in spite of Horace's glowing prophecies, held their hands from a country which their common sense taught them was beyond even the long reach of an emperor governing at Rome; but the Scythians seem to have kept up the tradition of invasion and conquest, allowing the northern parts of India little rest before the Muhammadan invasion began. After a couple of inroads, one at the beginning of the eighth, the other at the end of the tenth century, the Muhammadans devoted themselves to a regular conquest which occupied three centuries. Then the Tartars raided Northern India, but found a permanent settlement inadvisable. How European influence established itself on the coast, and how, when the Mughal empire was breaking up, the English traders, by skilfully availing themselves of the divisions between the inhabitants of the peninsula, secured their own supremacy, we all know. It is treated in the chapter of our histories veraciously entitled the "Conquest of India." The spoils of this "conquest" have furnished, in the main, the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

materials for the various collections of oriental arms and armour described and discussed by Lord Egerton. Traces of the arms of the earlier semi-mythical period are stated to exist in sufficient numbers to repay an investigator, but they are scattered about the world. In the arms of the historic period, however, England is, naturally, exceptionally rich. The only other really good collection is possessed by the Emperor of Russia, who has wisely had his possessions carefully catalogued, illustrated, and described. With our characteristic indifference in matters of art and antiquities we have left this important work to private enterprise. The authorities have never even taken any steps whatever towards amalgamating the treasures divided between the India Museum and the Tower; but lately, impressed with the fact that the collections in the Tower and the India Museum supplemented each other's deficiencies, by their respective duplicates, in a remarkable manner, they arranged for the removal of the latter collection to South Kensington, and so banished the temptation to act reasonably and piece out both into connected series. Fortunately for historians and antiquarians Lord Egerton, though his protests were unable to prevent the piece of official stupidity just mentioned, had the public spirit to draw up for general reference a descriptive catalogue of the Indian Museum collection, illustrated by numerous plates, and preceded by a sketch in outline of the history of Indian warfare, containing information enough to enable the general reader to grasp the historic importance of the objects described; while a later chapter of the work calls attention to their artistic value. Not content with his first attempt to remedy official neglect, he has been at considerable pains to make the alterations in his work necessitated by the transfer already alluded to, to enlarge and in part rewrite the text, and to add an illustrated catalogue of his own remarkable collection of Oriental arms. To an Englishman anything about India ought to be interesting. *Anglus sum, nil Indianum a me alienum puto*, ought to be a suitable motto for every Briton who can even faintly grasp the overwhelming and daily increasing importance of Indian questions in their bearing on Imperial matters. To the historian and amateur the work of Lord Egerton appeals in a special degree. To the latter because the artistic importance of many of the weapons is evident to the merest tyro. To the former not merely for the intrinsic interest they possess as recalling the stirring contests of bygone ages, but also because arms and their decoration have an ethnographic bearing so notable as in some cases even to outweigh the evidences afforded by philology where questions of tribal origin and distribution are in dispute.

An experience of more than forty years as a collector of Eastern, and especially of Indian, implements of war, and of every kind of information relating thereto, has provided the noble author with a unique equipment for the task he set himself to perform, and is sufficient guarantee for the accuracy of his work, even without the careful revision it has received at the hands of other well-known authorities in Indian lore. It is, therefore, the more to be regretted that the book has hardly received fair treatment at the hands of the printer. The woodcuts are creditably drawn, but not so creditably printed; the full-page lithographic plates are uneven in quality, perhaps because the paper appears to vary in quality; the two coloured plates contrast not very favourably with such work as Messrs. Macmillan turned out in the illustrated edition of Green's short history a few years ago; the photographic plates of Lord Egerton's own collection are the best in the book. The paper upon which the book is printed is none of the best, in many places the woodcuts have printed through, and, moreover, it is not even of a uniform degree of mediocrity. If the naturally limited circulation of such a work prevents its publication in a really satisfactory form without involving its author in considerable pecuniary loss as the reward of his useful labour, might not the South Kensington authorities recognise the performance of a duty neglected by themselves, and subsidise the volume?

THE THEOSOPHY OF THE VEDAS.

The Upanishads: translated into English, with a Preamble and Arguments. By G. R. S. MEAD, B.A., M.R.A.S., and JAGADISHA CHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA (Roy Choudhuri). Vol. I. (London: Theosophical Publishing Society. Benares: The Theosophical Publishing Society. Madras: Theosophical Society, Adyar.)

This instalment of a fresh translation of the Upanishads includes "Ishopanishad, Kenopanishad, Kathopanishad, Prashnopanishad, Mundakopanishad, and Mândûkyopanishad." The object of the translators is "to place the sublime teachings of the Upanishads within the reach of every man and woman who can read the English tongue." That object is unimpeachably good; but, as there seems to be no mention of previous English translations, it may be recalled to the memory of the translators that Professor Max Müller devoted two volumes of the series of "Sacred Books of the East" to the Upanishads, one of these volumes leading off the series. The translation is very difficult work, and it is not surprising to find here occasional deviations from the rendering given by Professor Max Müller of such Upanishads as are common to both. The stricter adherence to literal equivalence in the present issue, and the more sparing use of explanatory additions, whatever their advantage in other respects, certainly increase the ordinary reader's difficulties in understanding the sense. "The Upanishads," say the present translators, "should be allowed to speak for themselves, and not be left to the mercy of artificial commentators." Everything depends upon the quality of the commentator; and it is hardly possible but that the incidental suggestions of a competent scholar should be more useful to the English neophyte than the uninstructed exercise of his own intelligence. Without skilled direction, indeed, it is a puzzle to say what foreign notions he may read into the vagueness of the texts. The Upanishads, we are told, "are grand outpourings of religious enthusiasm, raising the mind out of the chaos of ceremony and the metaphysical and philological word-spinning of the schools." The indefinite

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

sneer might have been spared, and the laudation might justly have been qualified. Such qualification was the very first task that Professor Max Müller addressed himself to in his preface to the "Sacred Books of the East." "We must face the problem in its completeness," he wrote, "and I confess it has been for many years a problem to me, aye, and to a great extent is so still, how the Sacred Books of the East should, by the side of so much that is fresh, natural, simple, beautiful, and true, contain so much that is not only unmeaning, artificial, and silly, but even hideous and repellent." This general acknowledgment is to a certain extent applicable to the Upanishads, and it is in the interests of scientific criticism that some account should be taken of it. Though the general run of students will hardly join in the ecstacies of the new translators, or even in the more balanced laudations of Schopenhauer, still the Upanishads must be always regarded as remarkable and important expressions of human thought. The popularisation of them in sixpennyworths is a very good idea, therefore, especially if the editors would extend their comment, and direct their effervescing enthusiasm into more definite and practically useful channels than childish literalness and slavish adherence to the order of words in the original. These things merely serve to perplex, and to invest the text with an irrelevant curiousness.

THE HINDU AT HOME.

The Hindu at Home, being Sketches of Hindu Daily Life. By the Rev. J. E. PADFIELD, B.D., Missionary, C. M. S., Masulipatam. (Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Madras.)

There is here gathered together a series of sketches which have appeared from time to time since 1885 in the pages of the *Madras Christian College Magazine*. They deal with the manners and customs of the Hindus, and especially with the orthodox section of the community who follow the rules of the Brahmanical religion. The position of missionaries does, no doubt, offer facilities to those who wish to use them of studying closely the daily lives of the people among whom they work, and Mr. Padfield appears to have used his opportunities well. As he most truly says:—

"Speaking as a missionary, it is impossible to be thoroughly 'in touch' with a people of whose social and religious habits and customs one may know but little or nothing. A knowledge of the daily life of the people aids in arriving at more or less correct conclusions as to their modes of thought and motives for action; and it is only with the aid of such knowledge that one can reasonably hope to attain much result in influencing them in such a deeply personal matter as religion."

Of course most of what he relates will be familiar to anyone who has visited India, and taken any interest in the native population, or has read one of the many books of this kind already published. But there is no new thing under the sun, and we have no doubt that the information here given is as correct and in as readable a form as in other books of greater pretensions. It is no uncommon thing for a missionary to write a book. Unfortunately, it is also not uncommon for the book to be the most unfavourable commentary on the intercourse between missionary and people. Mr. Padfield does not adopt the condescending tone. The way in which every act of a Hindu's life is regulated by his religion is obvious to every observer. From the moment of his birth to his death, there is scarcely an act too trivial to be hedged about with rite and ceremony. He is washed, clothed, and shaved in accordance with traditional observance. By the way, we suppose it is the missionary spirit which leads the author to terminate a chapter on the inconvenient formalities with regard to shaving by a reflection on the "glorious liberty" of the Christian. In such a connexion it savours somewhat of the ludicrous. There is a very clear and discriminating account of mendicity in India. There is no doubt that, however excellently the charity of the people may reflect upon the givers, one effect of so much unreflecting almsgiving is the existence of a large indolent class who pass their time without doing one stroke of useful work and are never made to feel either the distress of want or the degradation of their position. It is strange to notice how similar (if we allow for exaggeration of language) are the exhortations to charity to Brahman and Christian and how differently they are interpreted. But there is no doubt a more excellent way. The ceremonies of marriage and burial fill several chapters. These are the most striking and the most familiar of all. The observances vary a little from place to place. They are elaborate, lengthy, and expensive.

"There is no greater cause of financial misery in Hindu families than expenses at marriages and funerals. In the case of wealthy men the burden is a great one; but in ordinary cases the funds have to be obtained from the money-lender at an exorbitant rate of interest, loading the poor victims with a lifelong burden of debt. The amelioration of matters of this kind amongst such a people can only be effected by a gradual growth of public opinion in the right direction, and any change of opinion, sufficient to be felt, must occupy a very long time in its formation."

The Hindus, perhaps more than other nations, are superstitious, and everything is an omen for good or ill. The brief facts that Mr. Padfield gives are full of interest and suggestion to those who are acquainted with the superstitions of other countries. For instance, the tingling of the right side of the body is auspicious, of the left side unfavourable; if a cat cross a traveller's path, his journey will be unlucky; and many besides these suggest parallels. Throughout the book the greatest care has been taken to quote the authorities for statements with regard to Hindu customs, in English and often with

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
IS
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.
In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).
Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed.
Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Sanskrit equivalent, thus rendering the book additionally valuable, not simply to the English scholar, but to the Hindu himself.

A HINDUSTANI GRAMMAR.

A Practical Hindustani Grammar. By Lieutenant-Colonel A. O. GREEN, R.E. In 2 parts. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press.)

Colonel Green deserves the thanks of Englishmen who take up their residence in India, either in the capacity of officials, or as members of the increasing and by no means insignificant class who are occupied in industrial and commercial pursuits. The official who is bound to pass his departmental examination will find this "practical" Hindustani Grammar to be of great value. To the non-official, who is under no obligation to make a special study of the language and seldom has recourse to a *Munshi*, it will be of still greater value. With ordinary patience he will easily master the exercises, while Part II will remove any difficulties that may come in his way. Colonel Green would perhaps have done well to add a vocabulary to Part I which would not require more than half the space that is taken up by the "Selected Manuscripts" printed at the end of the book. The ordinary student who desires merely to obtain a colloquial knowledge of Hindustani, or to be able to read printed or lithographed books, will never probably be called upon to read a manuscript. The official who, in the course of his duties, is required to read manuscripts cannot familiarise himself too early with such documents. But the Hindustani manuscript is in the nature of a "short-hand," and it is impossible for any one to read it without the aid of an instructor specially conversant with writings of that kind. When an official takes up his duties, the papers that come before him probably afford him the best opportunity of learning to read the freehand, and his reader, or Shereshtedar, is his most convenient instructor. There is one defect to which Hindustani manuals written by Europeans are usually subject, and from which Colonel Green's compilation cannot claim to be free. Social intercourse between Europeans and Indians is, for many reasons, restricted, but there is one obstacle which it is possible to remove. Repectable Indians often complain that Europeans, in conversation with them, use language that Indians use only towards menials. In English, for example, the personal pronoun "you" is employed indiscriminately without regard to the position of the person addressed. It is not so in Hindustani, which requires the use of the pronoun *ap* in polite conversation. At page 44 Colonel Green refers to *ap* "as a substitute for the second person to express respect in addressing a superior in rank, like the English words 'sir,' 'your honour,' 'your worship,' etc." This mistake is common among Europeans, and it has a mischievous effect. The word *ap* is not necessarily used in addressing a superior. On the contrary it is commonly used out of courtesy. The meaning put upon it by Colonel Green is, however, accepted by many Englishmen who avoid the use of the word *ap*, and use the word *tum* in addressing respectable Indians and often, by so doing, unconsciously insult them. Curiously enough Colonel Green falls into the other extreme at p. 149 where to the word *mali* ("gardener") he attaches the affix *ji*. The affix *ji* is added as a special mark of respect, and would not ordinarily be applied to a gardener. There are other colloquial errors in some of the exercises which an Indian, whose mother tongue is Hindustani, would have detected. But the Grammar nevertheless possesses real merit and is likely to be useful. It undoubtedly supplies a want, as its predecessors were too elementary to be of much value except to beginners.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1896.

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). "R. E. C." "Railway Enterprise in Western India." Pope, Dr. G. U. "Leaves from an old Indian's Note Book." Kabiruddin, Kazi. "How I discovered the Ashburner Trees." Bahadurji, J. N. "Medical Aid for Indian Women."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Hewitt, J. F. "Hindu Civilization under British Rule."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1896.

"A DIRECTORY OF THE CHIEF INDUSTRIES OF INDIA." (W. Thacker and Co.)	— —
"THE *Indian Textile Journal* REFERENCE SHEET OF COTTON SPINNING AND WEAVING MILLS IN INDIA." (F. A. Nodal, Manchester)	2s. 0d.
ARNOLD, Sir EDWIN, K.C.I.E., C.S.I. "East and West," with 41 Illustrations by R. T. Pritchett. (Longmans)	18s. 0d.
STURDY, E. T. "Nârada Sûtra: an Enquiry into Love." Indian Ideals, No. I. (Longmans)	2s. 6d.
BALLANTINE, H. "On India's Frontier, or Nepal the Gurkha's Mysterious Land." 50 Plates. (George Redway)	7s. 6d.
MORRIS, HENRY. "The Governors-General of India." Portraits. (The Christian Literature Society of India)	— —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

135.	EAST INDIA. (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND)—Return of, for the half year ended on 31st March, 1896	½d.
	PAPERS BY COMMAND:—	
[7991.]	EAST INDIA (OPIUM)—Correspondence regarding the Report by the Royal Commission on Opium	6d.
[7997.]	TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA, Statement of the, with British Possessions and Foreign Countries for the Five Years 1890-91 to 1894-95	2s. 9d.
[8042.]	EAST INDIA (NORTH-WEST FRONTIER, BASHGAL VALLEY)—Agreement signed by the Joint Commissioners for laying down the Afghan Boundary from the Hindu Kush Range to Nawa Kotal, and confirmed by H.H. the Amír of Afghanistan on the 19th December, 1895	½d
[8078.]	EAST INDIA (INDIAN TARIFF ACT AND THE COTTON DUTIES)—Papers relating to the INDIAN TARIFF ACT, 1896, and the Cotton Duties Act, 1896 (in continuation of C.—7602/1895.)	1s. 8d.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.
CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 7. (NEW SERIES.) JULY, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	193
The Cotton Duties, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	198
Indian Troops in the Sudan, by J. Dacosta	200
Indian Revenue and Expenditure, by W. M. J. Williams	201
Education at High Pressure	203
The History of the Transvaal	205
Indian Ideals	207
University Reform in India	208
The Detective as Judge	209
A Complacent Philosopher	210
The Financial Peril	212
Our London Letter	213
Indian Troops in the Sudan: Rumoured Second Thoughts	214
Mr. Morley Speaks Out	215
Some Opinions of the Press	216
The Transvaal and India	220
Reviews: Indian Criminal Law	222
Men of the South	223
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	224
Recent Official Publications	224

Indiana.

Mr. Morley Speaks Out.

THE speech which Mr. John Morley delivered at Leeds on June 3rd, at a Conference summoned to consider the policy of the Government in the Sudan, will be remembered in India for many a day to come. No clearer or juster statement of the duty of the House of Commons towards India has ever been made by so prominent and powerful a British statesman. "If," said Mr. Morley, speaking of the members of the House of Commons, "if we are anything, we are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented natives of India." The sentence was greeted with cheers. Nothing, indeed, is more certain than that popular audiences in the United Kingdom are always ready to endorse the strictest and most unselfish theory of their relations with their Indian fellow-subjects. The pride and prejudice of bureaucratic officers are alien to them. They are just as ready to resent the notion of irresponsible authority in India, when the issue is clearly put before them, as they would be to resent the notion of irresponsible authority at home. When the people, as distinguished from the official class, of India make their appeal to the people, as distinguished from the official class, of the United Kingdom, they find an entirely sympathetic audience. Mr. Morley amplified his memorable phrase as follows:—

"It is even more important that we should recognise our representative duty to them [the people of India] than it is to you, because you can call us, if we displease you, quickly to account. You can make yourselves heard. You can press your views and opinions upon us. But the natives of India cannot."

In other words, every member of the House of Commons, far from neglecting Indian questions because, in the slang of the lobby, there are "no votes behind them," is bound for that very reason to make it a point of honour to attend to them. It is an unexceptionable maxim, and Mr. Morley undoubtedly practises what he preaches. To take only two recent instances, he was one of the foremost champions of the right of the people of India to raise revenue from import duties if they were so minded, and, during the past two months, he has taken the lead in examining and cross-examining the Treasury Bench upon their proposal—of which they now seem to be a little ashamed—to charge upon the Indian revenues the "ordinary" expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan. We only hope that Mr. Morley's words will be laid to heart both by members of Parliament and by the electors who return them. His words lose none of their significance when it is remembered that only his reluctance to give up the Irish work to which he had set his hand prevented him from becoming Secretary of State for India in the late Government when Lord Kimberley went to the Foreign Office.

The Wit and Wisdom of Sir J. Colomb.

NEEDLESS to say Mr. Morley's theory is not at all the theory of a large section of Anglo-Indian officials. Their theory—which happens, by an odd

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

coincidence, to be flattering to their own position—is that the whole task of governing India should be left in the undisputed possession of "experts," in other words, of the Government of India reinforced by such Anglo-Indians as, on their return home, are elected by Conservative constituencies to the House of Commons. So complete, indeed, is their faith in their own powers, and their conviction of the incompetence of others, that in India they insist upon combining the functions of detective and magistrate, public prosecutor and criminal judge, revenue officer and Court of Revenue Appeal. This theory of the omniscience and the omnipotence of the "expert," and the ignorance of everybody else, was aptly illustrated a day or two before Mr. Morley spoke. Sir J. Colomb, who, as Morley pleasantly put it, is "not exactly an oracle of wisdom," gave notice of the following motion in the House of Commons:

"To call attention to the over-sea employment of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and to the particular proposal for their employment at Suakin; and to move, that, in view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of this House, and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, debates partaking in any sense of a party character relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire."

Now, this, as Mr. Morley said, is "a very silly motion," and it provoked great amusement among the good people of Leeds, who do not appear to be awe-struck at the "practical knowledge and administrative experience" by which Sir John Colomb may be said to be "characterised generally." The motion was designed, of course, a double debt to pay. Mr. Balfour had given notice, before the Whitsuntide recess, that on June 4th the motion to authorise the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan would be submitted to the House of Commons. But, in the meantime, the inconvenient contents of the Italian Green-book had become known. Also, the Government of India had protested against the proposal of the Cabinet to charge the "ordinary" expenses of the troops upon the Indian revenues. Accordingly the resolution and the debate were postponed. It was feared, however, that the subject would be brought up on a motion for adjournment, and Sir John Colomb's motion was designed to "block" any such proceedings. It failed in this purpose because it was so badly drawn, and it was so badly drawn because of Sir John Colomb's anxiety to have a dry wipe at independent members who, greatly daring, venture to discuss Indian questions in the House of Commons and even in his august presence.

"A Very Silly Motion."

"WE shall be prepared" said Mr. Morley "to debate that motion—that the House of Commons is so ignorant of Indian affairs that we must allow Her Majesty's Government in Downing Street and the Government at Calcutta to do whatever they like." It may be doubted, however, whether Sir John Colomb is prepared to debate it. We venture to think that the motion will be permitted to disappear—not because we doubt for a moment its author's willingness to lecture the House of Commons on its want of practical knowledge and administrative experience, but because if he were to bring the question to debate he would, obviously, be committing the transgression which he so eloquently deplores. The general question has often been discussed in our pages. But there are one or two particular criticisms which Sir J. Colomb's "very silly motion" seems to suggest. He deprecates debates "relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty." Yet, curiously enough, his motion has its ostensible origin in the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan. What, we should like to know, were the "arrangements agreed upon" in this case "by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty"? Why, the whole point of the thing was that no arrangements had been agreed upon at all. Until independent members of the House of Commons, devoid of "practical knowledge and administrative experience of India," had had recourse to Parliamentary questions, the "responsible advisers of Her Majesty," in defiance of the Act of 1858, refrained even from announcing to Parliament the fact that Indian troops had been ordered to Suakin. The Secretary of State for India, and his colleagues in the Cabinet, left the House of Commons to glean that news from Reuter's telegrams, and, even at a later stage, were not only prepared to ignore statutory requirements and to override precedent, but were obviously in a state of sublime, or ridiculous, uncertainty as to the nature of their own intentions. Sir John Colomb could not, we think, have chosen a less opportune occasion to preach the sacrosanct inviolability of "arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of Her Majesty." Sir John Colomb is a zealous, if not a discreet, admirer of the Government of India. Has he forgotten that the unanimous desire of independent members of the House of Commons was, and is, that the representations of the Government of India should be acceded to, and that no charge in respect of the Sudan expedition should fall upon India? What the House of Commons was really doing—and, if rumour may be trusted, not without success—was to strengthen the hands of Lord G. Hamilton against his colleagues in the Cabinet. When Lord Salisbury was Secretary of State for India, he said that the most effectual way of securing financial justice for India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India and British Parties.

ANOTHER stipulation of Sir J. Colomb's is that debates on Indian affairs must not "partake in any sense of a party character." There is, no doubt, a good deal to be said for this opinion. But against whom, we wonder, is it urged? The Indian Parliamentary Committee, at any rate, has spared no pains to secure the co-operation of members of both parties. We referred last month to the negotiations which preceded the recent debate on Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the Indian cotton duties. What happened was that in private conversation "Unionist" members who are also specially acquainted with Indian affairs were quite ready to endorse the representations of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and were willing to roar like lions against the weakness of Lord G. Hamilton and the selfishness of Lancashire. But when it came to an actual debate they roared like any sucking dove. They were as courageous as so many mice. There they sat, submissive to their party Whips, holding, no doubt, the strongest possible opinions, but too timid to utter even a single word. We do not hesitate to say that if the charge of making debates on Indian affairs "partake of a party character" lies at anybody's door, it lies at the door of these dreadfully nervous Conservatives, who, for party reasons, abstain from saying what they ought to say and what, if only they dared, they would very much like to say. But it is the height of assurance when, having held their tongues and neglected their duty through sheer subservience to their own Front Bench, they rail at independent Liberal members who, no matter whether their party is in office or in opposition, have the courage of their convictions. The Indian Parliamentary Committee would, no doubt, be glad to have the assistance of Sir J. Colomb and his friends in keeping the Secretary of State up to the mark. But Sir J. Colomb and his friends, if we may judge them by their fruits, are utterly indifferent to the interests of India. What are the Indian questions that have been brought before the House of Commons during the present Session? To mention the most important of them, there were, in February, the invasion of Kafiristan, the retention of Chitral (as to which the "experts" are so hopelessly at variance), the heavy rate of mortality in Indian prisons, and the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar; in March, the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers, the Patna and Jhalawar cases, the Durand Treaty, and the Land Revenue System in Madras; in April, the treatment of British Indian subjects in South Africa, the despatch of Indian troops to the Sudan, and the blunder about the Bashgal valley; and in May, Kafiristan again, the occupation of the Malakand Pass, the Indian troops in the Sudan, and the debate on the cotton duties. Yet in all these cases the initiative was left to the Indian Parliamentary Committee, while Sir John Colomb and his friends remained silent.

How not to Argue.

IN this connexion we may dispose of a mare's-nest recently discovered by an Anglo-Indian contemporary. The *Pioneer*, which, like Captain Costigan, is always good-natured and sometimes almost trustworthy, calls attention to what it chooses to regard as an inconsistency in our April number. It seems that, at one and the same time, we congratulated the Indian Parliamentary Committee upon an accession of strength and condemned Lord George Hamilton's re-arrangement of the cotton duties. But where is the inconsistency? If the Indian Parliamentary Committee had been stronger, Lord George Hamilton's iniquitous re-arrangement would never have been made. As it was, it was solely through the efforts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee that the re-arrangement was brought on for discussion in the House of Commons, and the opinions of the people, and the Government, of India obtained a hearing. The *Pioneer* has the assurance, or the humour, to argue that if we protest against bad "legislation forced by England upon the Government of India" we must not applaud and encourage the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Was ever such an argument heard outside Bedlam? It ought to be, but apparently it is not, superfluous to say that "intervention" from London in the affairs of India is neither good nor bad in itself, but that it deserves praise or blame according to the purpose which it has in view.

Another "Frontier" Scare.

THE latest scare about the North-West frontier is developing. From time to time "feelers" are being thrown out to ascertain the state of public opinion with regard to another advance, this time with Kandahar as its immediate objective, in conformity with the half-avowed aim of the forward policy at its great revival in 1876. After sounding the note of alarm, to which attention was called in our last issue, the *Times* has proceeded to suggest openly the continuation of existing lines of railway as far as Kandahar. Before the matter is allowed to go further it may be well to consider in the light of past history what are likely to be the consequences of an advance, and whether the probable results are proportionate to the probable cost. For surely in India, if anywhere, is applicable the principle lately laid down by the Home Government in connexion with the Sudanese campaign, that our advance must be limited by our means (in this case, the means of India) if by no higher considerations. Some few months ago, when the Indian estimates came before

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Council, Sir James Westland took credit to himself for moderation in basing his calculations on a rupee value of 1s. 1¾d., and anticipated a comfortable margin in consequence. His hopes of the maintenance of the value of the rupee have been only imperfectly realised. At present it is worth 1s. 2d. and there is absolutely no guarantee that it will not fall lower, so that no improvement can be looked for in that quarter. An increase of taxation is impossible without serious jeopardy to British power in India, for it is clearly felt that in this incessant frontier warfare Imperial and not Indian interests are at stake, and India is not prepared to make sacrifices to further a policy she disapproves at a time when she is crushed under the burdens imposed upon her in the last twenty years by the action of that policy. Sir Auckland Colvin as Finance Minister in 1885 calculated the normal annual expenditure on the Indian army at less than fifteen millions sterling, or, excluding cost of exchange, Rx.15,000,000; add a million for military works, and Rx.16,000,000 becomes the standard. In the last twenty years the aggregate excess of military expenditure over this standard has amounted to more than 52 millions of tens of rupees. Of this twelve millions were required for the Afghan war. In case the Amír, as is likely, refuses his consent to the continuation of the North-West railway, we may be asked to contemplate a repetition of this expense and of the horrors of Kabul and Kandahar. Nearly 14 millions have been spent on the additions to the military establishment necessitated by the occupation of Quetta after the Penjdeh incident. Four millions went in the annexation of Burma, and the remaining 22 millions were spent in the occupation of Burma, expeditions, etc. During the last eleven years alone the item of minor expeditions has accounted for no less than 7¾ millions of tens of rupees, including the cost of the Chitral blunder, which alone reached 2¼ millions.

The Russian Spectre.

IT would not be difficult to show that this fatuous pursuit of an impossible frontier, originated by a purely military clique for the usual reasons, has cost India much more than the accounts indicate. A reversal of policy would not only mean the reduction of these extra charges, but a decrease of the standard cost also. But even as they stand the figures form a terrible indictment against the Indian Government. It cannot with any plausibility be maintained that this enormous expenditure has benefited India in the remotest degree. It has been incurred solely to advance a policy based on imaginary Imperial interests, and inspired by a fear of the Russian bogey, in which India has no part beyond paying the cost. Both Indians and Anglo-Indians, not excepting the bulk of the civil servants who see the fruits of their labour squandered in the mountains of Afghanistan, are agreed as to the hopelessness of anything like a serious invasion on the North-West frontier, and the futility of this panic advance. But thanks to the system which provides for a preponderance of the military element in the Council the military clique at Simla is enabled to override all sane opinion, and wage war for its own glory at the expense of India. Surely the barest justice seems to dictate that if an offshoot of the British Government wishes to wage war to safeguard imaginary British interests the British Government should bear the cost. If the Imperial Exchequer were saddled with the expense and the British taxpayer could thereby be roused to take an interest in these proceedings the rule of the Simla clique could not endure for a day. Unless, however, the Royal Commission now sitting falsifies the very moderate hopes we have been led to entertain by the conduct hitherto of its enquiry into Indian expenditure, it is to be feared that reform will be delayed until British opinion receives some rude shock to rouse it from its lethargy. Meanwhile the Russophobist policy proceeds, involving a steady and continual drain of men and treasure, drawing the army ever farther from its base into wastes where even railway communication is unreliable, as experience has shown in the Quetta district, creating discontent and increasing the oppressive taxation of a poverty-stricken and long-suffering people, and entailing finally beyond all doubt some renewal of the troubles of 1842 and 1878.

Simla's Nightmares.

THE fallacy which underlies the whole position of the Russophobists is an entire misconception of the lines of Russian policy. Other European nations are by their position forced to admit conflicting considerations in determining their policy. Russia, as isolated almost as England, in spite of her South-Western frontier, is able to consult entirely her own interests. In spite, therefore, of all that has been said about the duplicity of Russian diplomacy, her course of action can under any given circumstances be predicted with much greater accuracy than is possible in the case of any other foreign nation. She will in all cases act so as to secure her own advantage, and her advance, whenever she does advance, will follow the line of least resistance. Assuredly that line does not pass through the highlands of Afghanistan. Already in 1842 Russia had perceived the extreme sensibility of England to threatened assaults on the North-West frontier and the frantic energy with which she threw herself into the work of securing India against such assaults. The result of the first Afghan war taught her how she might always engage England's attention and seduce her into the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

vain expenditure of men and money. She was not slow to profit by her knowledge. When in 1878 Lord Beaconsfield, having brought the country to the verge of war, ordered Indian troops to Malta, Russia replied to his threats by intrigues at Kabul which the Government allowed to involve them in the disastrous war of 1878 to 1880. Again in 1885, acting no doubt in the interests of her friend and ally, France, she arranged the famous Penjdeh incident which caused the hurried abandonment of the Sudan in order that the troops might be set free for a possible Russian war. In neither case did she intend to push matters to extremities; that would have injured her interests. The history of the last three years alone is sufficient to illustrate the absolute selfishness of her policy, which is the best guarantee for the inviolability of the North-West frontier. She has utilised her friendship with France to secure her position in the Far East, the real goal of her ambition, and in return has granted her ally the privilege of floating her loans. It is clearly understood that France cannot rely on her aid in any attempt to avenge her defeat of 1870, and it ought to be equally clear, to all who care to see, that Russia has no intention of risking a war with England to please her ally. At the present time the position of 1885 is reproduced. England is engaged once more in an attempt to conquer the Sudan, and France, now a power in Central Africa, feels more than ever that her position is threatened by the continued occupation of Egypt, and the presence of Egyptian troops led by Englishmen in the Equatorial Provinces. So she claims the support of Russia to aid her in foiling British intrigues, and that support she will obtain so far as is consistent with Russia's material advantages. In the matter of the Caisse de la Dette, which involves England in a certain amount of embarrassment, France has received the unqualified support of her ally, for there such support can involve her in no further liability. The feint on Herat is but a well-timed replica of the Penjdeh affair arranged with a view to check the transport of Indian troops for use in the Sudan. But there should be no doubt as to its real character. If there should become evident a desire on the part of England to retain her African conquests as compensation for the expense she seems likely to incur, the railway towards Herat will be pressed on. But it is none the less impossible that Russia should meditate an invasion in order to create a diversion in favour of France. Still an opportunity will be afforded to the Simla authorities to create another scare, organise another expedition, and annex another batch of honours and decorations. Therefore it cannot be too soon or too strongly emphasised that this new alarm is as groundless as its predecessors, and that Simla's nightmares must not be allowed to add another rupee to the already overwhelming burden under which India is struggling.

Indian Sea-borne Trade.

W. M. W. writes: — "Herewith are presented the totals of Indian over-sea commerce, for the year ending with March last, and the two previous years. The figures, derived directly from the official returns, are set out somewhat differently from the forms usually adopted in English and in Indian journals. Our object is to bring out, more clearly than is done by the usual method, the one great factor which dominates India's position as a trading country. That factor, the perennial excess of India's exports, is often conspicuous by its absence from articles on Indian commerce.

SEA-BORNE TRADE OF BRITISH INDIA.

MERCHANDISE AND TREASURE.

	1895-6	1894-5	1893-4
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Exports	118,606,000	117,140,000	110,604,000
Imports	86,304,000	83,110,000	93,483,000
India's Excess of Exports	Rx. 32,302,000	Rx. 34,030,000	Rx. 17,119,000

The *net* Imports of Treasure in the three years (the totals on both sides being included in the above) were in millions Rx.:—

9·13 1·40 14·41

It will be observed that the net imports of treasure in 1894-5 were abnormally small. This circumstance was due to the unusual export of gold from India in that year, amounting to Rx. 4·97, as against net import of silver Rx. 6·37. The explanation of this outflow of the yellow metal from India in that period must be sought for mainly in the peculiar course of the bullion market in the western world, the chief feature of which was the enhanced appreciation of gold. There was also the effect of the closing of the Indian Mints, with the subtle variations affecting silver primarily, but chiefly, as will be noticed, sending the flow of gold back to the west. These special currents, as affecting the monetary and commercial affairs of India, need not be traced here at present.

The Excess of Indian Exports.

"WHAT in these figures most broadly and deeply concerns the current 'Condition of India' question is the large excess of her exports, amounting in the year closed on March 31st last to thirty-two and a-half crores of rupees. In the three years before us that excess amounts to the immense aggregate of Rx. 83½ millions —sent or drawn out of India, for which no commercial or monetary return was received or is receivable. City editors using the customary phrase, as applied to independent States of the West, may continue to speak of this excess of exports as 'the balance of trade in favour of' India. But economists or statesmen who look at the matter from the Indian standpoint can only regard that phrase as bitterly ironical. Any 'favour' there may be in this net adverse result

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of India's trading transactions pertains mainly to the United Kingdom, which absorbs most of this never repaid excess of India's exports. As to details of this last year's Indian trade, one or two points of slight relief may be noted: thus the imports were 3¼ crores more than in 1894-5, and the exports of Indian manufactured cottons to the Far East had nearly recovered the set-back attributed to the adverse influence of the closing of the mints. On the other hand the imports of cotton goods from the West had not reached the high level of the two years before the imposition of the duties; but Lancashire is now rapidly making up its normal volume of exports to India. Though it is interesting to note these and similar fluctuations, they have little or only intermittent bearing on the essential facts of India's foreign commerce."

THE COTTON DUTIES.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

"IT is admitted by everyone," Lord George Hamilton told a deputation of gentlemen interested in the Lancashire cotton trade, on the 11th of December last, "that, excepting perhaps the ties which race and religion may weave, the bonds of commerce are the most powerful instruments known for holding together the interests of scattered communities and of welding them together in an Empire. But if trade and commerce are so to work," he went on to say, "they must operate equally for the interests which they touch, and, whenever it is in any way necessary to adopt a tariff policy which sets great industrial communities in different parts of the world in the same Empire in antagonism or collision one with another, then the germs of disunion are created and the stability of that Empire is threatened." Then there emerges what Lord Salisbury called a matter of dangerous contention. Unhappily there is no doubt about the danger. But then if the doctrine is applicable to India, how much more applicable is it to the Colonies? Yet, somehow or other, the official Conservative mind regards with complacency, undisturbed by any menace to the stability of the Empire, such "germs of disunion" as the imposition and maintenance of hostile tariffs by any or all of the Colonial Governments. Again, what an abject slavery to words and to official cant it is to talk of the "welding together" of the interests of India and England in such a fashion as this! If India were in the freer position of a self-governing Colony, she would maintain the cotton duties, and she would not tolerate for a moment a single *pie* of countervailing excise. England is supposed to govern India for India's good—not for the good of Lancashire; yet, in this matter of cotton duties, India is controlled expressly in the supposed interests of Lancashire. And what a wretched peddling the whole business is! Instead of preventing the necessity for the reimposition of the cotton duties at all, the great wise and eminent legislators and administrators of the time are posing as laborious statesmen in the twopenny-halfpenny balancing of a trumpery excise—trumpery enough for England—against the chances of some possible atom of advantage to India, whose interests are totally diverse and incomparably more seriously affected.

Sir Henry Fowler, however, laid down the principle that there must be no element of protection in the operation of the cotton duties, and Lord George Hamilton must maintain the traditional continuity of policy. Thanks to the independent, not to say magnanimous, attitude of the Indian millowners and merchants, the quarrel on this point is to some extent modified. "The history of the past ten or fifteen years," said Sir James Westland,

"shows that Indian industries in a fair field and without any adventitious aid can even more than hold their own; and millowners and merchants in India are at one in declaring that they want no special terms of any kind, no treatment in which Manchester is not admitted to a perfectly equal share."

True, Lancashire trade has been suffering from depression. True, also that such depression has not been to any great extent due to the Indian cotton duties. Still, as the Finance Minister put it, "whatever may be the immediate future of the Lancashire industry, it behoves us to be careful that none of its misfortunes—if any such should be in store—be in any way attributable to any unequal action on our part." Now, this attitude would be completely satisfactory—for the moment at least—if cotton spinners and cotton merchants were the only parties whose interests are involved. But, unfortunately, this is not the case. Sir James Westland properly dealt with the question "on the assumption that the tax, whatever it is, falls upon and is paid by the Indian consumer," and he justly castigated the economic heresy of "much of the language held in Manchester," which seemed "to indicate a belief that the tax really falls upon the producer there." But it was left to Mr. Playfair and the native members to point out the true effect of the Bills—the Cotton Duties and Tariff Bills, 1896—before the Legislative Council.

"The proposals under these Bills," said Mr. Playfair, "mean a remission of taxation of Rs. 51½ lakhs (or 37 per cent.) on Manchester goods and an increase of Rs. 11 lakhs (or 300 per cent.) of taxation on Indian-made goods. . . . . It is a transfer of taxation from the richer to the poorer classes of the community, that is not required for fiscal considerations, that is not warranted when a surplus in the finances is available, and I may add that the annoyance is intensified by the knowledge that this shifting of taxation cannot be of the least benefit to Lancashire."

To the same effect spoke Mr. Bhuskate.

"Millions," he said, "will have to buy their coarse cloth at an unnecessarily higher price which is sure to tell heavily on their impoverishment. Those who are best able to pay for a tax, and that, too, in proportion to their higher comfort, will have their tax reduced, and the deficit will be filled up by the poorest, all other circumstances remaining the same."

Such is substantially the plain effect of these unfortunate and oppressive Cotton Duties and Tariff Acts of 1896.

The importance of this view, if it be the correct view, drew from Sir James Westland an elaborate attempt at refutation. The statement that "the effect of our legislation is to relieve from taxation the richer classes of India, and put upon the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

poorer classes a burden which they are not at present liable to bear" is, he argued, "entirely without foundation, unless we accept the theory that the cotton goods imported from Manchester are wholly consumed by a certain class called the richer class, and the goods manufactured in India are wholly consumed by another class called the poorer class." Sir James says the bulk of the consumers both of Manchester and of Indian goods is the middle class, the "85 per cent. of the population" that are "well enough off to pass, without any relief from the State, through the worst of famines" and are in fact "really fairly well off according to their own lights, their own traditions, and their own standards." Such reliance on official statistics is quite heroic. Such a description of the condition of the bulk of the population of India could not be accepted by any observer but an official labouring under some overmastering compulsion; and no reader of these columns will require a repetition of the facts that forbid its acceptance. But apart from that, the form of statement of the opposing view exhibits an ingenuity of dialectic worthy of a Greek sophist or of a mediæval schoolman. Look at the plain facts. Before these Acts were passed, the duty stood at 5 per cent. assessed upon yarns of counts 20s and upwards. After the Acts passed, the duty stood at 3½ per cent. assessed upon woven goods of all counts. The reduction of the amount of duty relieves the pockets of those that are able to purchase the finer counts; the extension of the duty to counts under 20s brings a fresh tax upon those that cannot afford the finer counts. If some 85 per cent. of the population are agricultural labourers, and something like a half of them, not to put it higher, are constantly on the brink of famine and starvation, it is easy enough to see how the new arrangement will work out in practice. Even in the case of those that use both Manchester and Indian cloths, the additional pressure will obviously inflict hardship. Sir James Westland himself in moving for leave to introduce the Bills, had largely admitted, as he was bound to do, the substance of his opponents' contention when he pointed to the reduction of the duty from 5 per cent. to 3½ as a counterbalancing consideration to "this addition to the taxation that has to be paid in part at least by the poorer classes in India." It was not quite worthy of his fairness to exercise his dialectic on the word "classes," which he had himself used, or to represent in such rosy colours the material condition of the mass of the population.

It is worth while to reproduce Sir James Westland's statement of the attitude of the contending parties in the difficult and delicate matter of finding even a temporarily tolerable adjustment. The people in England ought to read, mark, and inwardly digest his:

"First, Manchester has systematically refused all information regarding the trade; it has left us to ferret out all the facts for ourselves. Secondly, it has not helped us by one single suggestion as to how to meet the difficulties inherent in the matter . . . except the financially impracticable one to abolish the duties altogether.

"The Bombay millowners, besides giving us a mass of helpful information, discuss some of the possible ways of meeting difficulties which they admit are not easy of satisfactory solution."

Yet the Manchester men believed themselves to be suffering from an intolerable grievance that had "inflicted serious injury" on their trade and constituted a dire menace to their future, while the Bombay men were equally satisfied that the grievance of Manchester was substantially fictitious and the remedy demanded essentially unjust to India. The contrast forms a painful element in the recent Blue-book. The drastic handling of the Manchester case by the Bombay critics leaves it a thing of mere rags and tatters. It is impossible to go into the details here. They stand on permanent record in the Blue-book, and are well worthy of careful study.

For this question is by no means finally settled. India has been coerced. "If I could see any hope of finality in the proposals," said Sir Griffith Evans, "I might accept the proposals even as I have often advised a client to abandon some part of what I thought were his strict legal rights to avoid a doubtful and hazardous litigation of which I could not foresee the issue." Lancashire makes its claim on the principle of free trade; the Government is handicapped by "the pressure of the semi-pledges of members of its party;" and the nation at large has no effective grasp of the facts of the situation. "The Government of India, in conducting the case, so to speak, for India, not without reason thinks it is worth some sacrifice and some concession to put the matter on such a basis that the point shall be conspicuous and indisputable." But the sense of injustice and the pressure upon the people still remain, and are bound to work out their natural results. Sir Griffith Evans briefly indicated two or three points of very serious importance:

"First, it is proposed to *sacrifice about 40 lakhs of revenue from the cotton duties.* I am not in a position to question the statement of the financial member that he is able to budget for a surplus considerably above this amount. But the spectre of famine is beginning to loom in the North-West, and exchange is uncertain, and it is most inadvisable to part with 40 lakhs of revenue which is raised without the consumer of the cotton goods feeling that he pays it—without discontent or annoyance. We shall never again be able to get it back when we need it, as we soon may, and *we may be driven to direct taxation, which in India means discontent.*

"Second, *the money is wanted for the development of the country,* and, even if it could be spared for remission of taxation, it ought to be applied to relieve the poorer classes from the income tax, which sorely oppresses them, as pointed out by Mr. Stevens last March. . . . .

"Third, pending adjustment of the markets, it is said by the Bombay millowners that the excise under 20s will cause a heavy temporary loss to the Indian mills, which the weaker ones may be unable to stand. Whether this is so or not, I am not certain, but *it is certain they believe it, and are smarting under a sense of injustice;* there will, at any rate, be *a large remission of indirect taxation on the well-to-do, and an imposition of taxation on the poorer classes,* so far as they consume the coarser goods of the Indian mills. . . . .

"Fourth, we are asked to *protect the hand-loom weavers by a 3½ per cent. duty, both against the Indian and Lancashire power-looms.* . . . . The figures produced by the Bombay millowners go to show that the hand-looms produce two-thirds of the cloth woven in India, as against one-third produced by power-looms; and the census tells a similar tale from the number of weavers. If this be so, the Indian power looms may receive a severe shock, and be more or less crippled by a 3½ per cent. protection to hand-looms. Moreover, in many places, I am informed, the hand-loom weavers weave from finer imported yarns. If this be so, we shall in endeavouring to free Lancashire from an imaginary indirect protection, create a direct protection against her in favour of the hand-loom. What practical effect this may have I have no means

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of judging, but I clearly see that Lancashire will not be slow in availing herself of this argument, and will probably join hands with the Indian millowners in abolishing the duties imposed by this Bill as being directly protective. I do not see what answer we shall have to this argument, as the permission to impose the duties is conditional on the total elimination of direct protection."

There is more than enough matter here to suggest the gravest doubts as to the stability of the present settlement; and there is much more behind. Furthermore, it is to be remembered that the whole difficulty is part of the price we have to pay for a "spirited policy" of military adventure on the borders of the Indian Empire. To repeat the words of Lord George Hamilton, "the germs of disunion are created, and the stability of that Empire is threatened." When will our legislators and administrators recognise that the safety of the Indian Empire lies within, and not without, its territorial borders—in the real prosperity and contentment of the people, and not in any other consideration whatsoever?

INDIAN TROOPS IN THE SUDAN.

By J. DACOSTA.

Within the last sixty years the safety of our rule in India has twice been jeopardised through the misuse of power by the officials entrusted with the control of our Indian administration. During the rule of the East India Company the tendency to act arbitrarily was restrained by the risk it involved of the Company forfeiting its privileges: but when the Board of Control on Indian affairs was created with a member of the British Government as its president the British Cabinet became practically a dominant partner in the Indian administration. From that time the restraint on the exercise of arbitrary power in Indian affairs was seriously impaired, and national misfortunes ensued in due course from the abuse of official authority.

The calamitous Afghan war of 1838-42, in which an entire British army was slaughtered and a heavy burden of debt imposed on the Indian taxpayer, was the work of the British Cabinet carried on through the instrumentality of the Board of Control. It was the first time, as the historian observed, that the people of India saw that British soldiers were not invincible. Furthermore the bloody mutinies of 1857-58, during which British rule in India trembled in the balance for upwards of a year, and great additional burdens of debt were imposed on our Indian fellow-subjects, were likewise the fruit of the disastrous policy of arbitrary annexation and confiscation, which the Government pursued with the aid of the Board of Control through the agency of Lord Dalhousie.

Painful as it is to recall these sad and humiliating events, it becomes a duty to remember them when the abuse of authority and the exercise of arbitrary power once more threaten India with their dire and inevitable consequences.

As regards the disasters just referred to, no official connected with the Government of India was summoned to answer for any share in their originating causes; and the impunity thus enjoyed by officers whose guilty acts had sown the seed of our misfortunes, necessarily encouraged their successors to tread the same unconstitutional path. The disasters were ascribed, not to any deviation by officers from the line of duty, but simply to the vicious system which ruled our Indian administration. Sweeping changes were therefore made in that system, with the view of allaying the national irritation and alarm which had prevailed during our troubles. The East India Company and the Board of Control were abolished and the Queen assumed the government of her Indian possessions through a Principal Secretary of State, a semblance of the governing machinery of the United Kingdom being thus imparted to the new system. The similarity however is entirely deceptive, seeing that the Secretaries charged with the government of the United Kingdom are responsible to Parliament where the people of that Kingdom have representatives to defend their interests, while the Secretary charged with the government of her Majesty's Indian possessions is responsible only to the British Parliament where the people of those possessions have no representative. The power vested in the Indian Secretary thus became virtually an irresponsible power.

It is true that clauses in the Act of Parliament by which the change of system was effected purport to restrict the Indian Secretary's authority within constitutional bounds; but other clauses of that Act and its context have been interpreted by the official just mentioned as neutralising the restrictions in question; whereby the danger inseparable from the exercise of irresponsible power has been completely revived.

We are proud to proclaim that the British Constitution requires taxation and popular representation to go hand in hand. At the same time we suffer those whose duty it is to uphold that Constitution, to violate its principle by conniving at two hundred and fifty millions of British subjects in India being taxed without representation, and deprived moreover of the protection which Parliament specially designed to confer upon them, when it enacted in 1858 that,

"except for repelling actual invasion or under sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond her external frontier, by her Majesty's forces charged upon the Indian revenues."

Now we have not only connived at the revenues of India being applied, continuously since 1876, to defray the expenses of military operations carried on beyond the Indian frontier, without the existence of the urgent necessity specified in the Act; but we are, at the present moment, conniving at her Majesty's forces charged on those revenues, being employed in Africa for the territorial aggrandisement of Egypt and the Turkish Empire, in flagrant violation of the Act referred to.

Recent statements in Parliament show that officials (with whose concurrence Indian troops are being employed in Africa) hold that such employment does not contravene section LV of the Act *for the better government of India*, simply because some extraordinary expense of the expedition might eventually fall on the Imperial exchequer.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Thus, on May 11th, Lord George Hamilton said:

"The apportionment between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India, of the expenses of the troops despatched to Suakin, is under consideration";

and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:

"I do not see the necessity of stating whether any or what part of the charges of these troops will be placed on the Imperial exchequer."

On May 12th Lord George Hamilton said:

"According to precedent no Resolution is necessary for the employment of Indian troops outside India, unless a charge is imposed on the Indian revenues for the purpose."

This view was supported by Mr. Balfour, who said:

"In point of actual law there is no obligation under the statute to have the assent of Parliament unless some extra charge is thrown upon the Indian finances";

and the same gentleman said the next day:

"The view of the Government—at least my view—on the the legal point is that there is no obligation to bring forward a Resolution in this House, if India is only charged with the ordinary expenses."

The interpretation of the Statute implied in these statements obviously stultifies its purport and ignores its intention. The interpretation clearly assumes that troops whose ordinary expenses—*i.e.*, whose recruitment, training, equipment, pay, and general maintenance, are defrayed from the revenues of India, are not in the sense of that Statute "forces charged on Indian revenues," so long as some extraordinary expense of the operation in which they are employed, might, at some future period, be defrayed from some other source.

Then, as regards the intention of the Statute, it is doubtless evident to the general public that Parliament, in enacting that troops maintained on the revenues of India should not, without urgent necessity, be employed in ventures beyond her frontier, intended that the revenues paid by her people should be applied to the protection and other wants of their country, and not be diverted to defray charges involved in the conquest of foreign territories.

There is also this great peril in the interpretation of the Statute suggested by the above-mentioned officials, that, if it be accepted, it would (logically, though only by sophistical logic) authorise the British Cabinet to involve the nation in actual warfare without applying to Parliament for supplies, whereby the first principle of the British Constitution—a principle on the strict observance of which we rely for the peace and safety of our country—would be rudely violated.

The *Times* of June 23rd published an important communication from Mr. John Marshall, Secretary to the Bombay Millowners' Association. With reference to Lord G. Hamilton's recent statement that "there were in the Native States, Berar, and the French Settlements of India nine cotton mills, containing 1,613 looms, as compared with 127 mills, containing 27,749 looms, in British India," Mr. Marshall wrote: "The facts are that there are 2,541 looms in non-British territory and 32,797 looms in British territory in India. The former number does not include looms in mills in the Berars, which, surely the Secretary of State for India knows, are British provinces, so far as taxation is concerned, and should not, therefore, be included as outside of British India."

INDIAN REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

By W. M. J. WILLIAMS.

India is at present prominent in the British Parliament, the despatch of troops to Suakin raising great questions, among them that of cost. It may therefore be of interest to give a *conspectus* of the Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India, including the money received and disbursed in London on behalf of India. To avoid any difficulty, should discrepancies arise in some of the figures it is necessary to supply, let it be said at once that these arise from the fact that the Indian Government Accounts are most complex, and are generally presented comprising a period of three years, much like an *exercisio* in some national accounts, with the result that the figures for any year are finally evolved from the chrysalitic state in which they are first presented as estimates, to pass on to revised estimates as the second state, and to appear ultimately as the account. This may be unavoidable, but eminently confusing. But, in any case, it will only be possible to give a mere summary of the vast and complex subject.

The gradual unfolding of the account is shown in brief as follows:

Gross Revenue and Expenditure.	Account 1893-4	Revised Estimate, 1894-5	Budget Estimate, 1895-6
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Revenue	90,565,214	95,154,100	96,924,300
Expenditure chargeable thereon	92,112,212	94,163,600	96,878,100
Surplus (+) or Deficit (—) ..	—1,546,998	+ 990,500	+ 46,200

The Net Revenue and Expenditure, explained below, is then given for this period:

Net Revenue and Expenditure.	Account 1893-4	Revised Estimate, 1894-5	Budget Estimate, 1895-6
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Net Revenue	50,328,023	53,738,300	53,948,500
Net Expenditure ..	51,875,021	52,747,800	53,902,000
(+ or —) ..	—1,546,998	+ 990,500	+ 46,200

The gross Revenue and Expenditure includes the accounts of various departments such as Post Office, Telegraphs, Railways, Army, etc., whose receipts and disbursements are given in a table below, showing the gross summary for 1894-5. The Net Revenue and Expenditure is found by omitting the accounts of these services and regarding only the revenue derived from taxes and the land, and opium. This net revenue is said in the "Explanatory Memorandum" to give "a clearer view of the financial condition" of the country than the gross revenue, and is defined as the "amount received from the principal sources after deducting the cost of collection," net expenditure "being the charges of the various departments after deducting the receipts of those departments."

But in order to obtain a view of the whole field of revenue and expenditure we now give a General

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Account for the year 1894-5. Notice that it is a final account:

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, YEAR ENDING MARCH, 1895.

		Rx.	Rx.
Revenue—Principal Heads:			
Land Revenue	..	25,408,272	
Opium	.. ..	7,323,757	
Salt	.. ..	8,665,749	
Stamps	.. ..	4,625,680	
Excise	.. ..	5,527,676	
Customs	.. ..	3,854,955	
Other Heads	..	8,179,032	
			63,585,121
Interest	.. ..		815,061
Post Office, Telegraph and Mint	..		2,645,618
Receipts by Civil Departments	..		1,628,960
Miscellaneous	.. ..		1,227,019
Railways	.. ..		21,244,160
Irrigation	.. ..		2,338,815
Buildings and Roads	.. ..		692,477
Receipts by Military Departments	..		1,010,197
Total Revenue	..	Rx.	95,187,429

There were Banking transactions regarding the Debts and Bills of the Government which, together with the Balances, made the receipts a grand total of Rx. 144,713,450.

Expenditure—			
Direct demands on the Revenue ("principal heads")	.. ..		9,722,041
Interest	.. ..		5,124,017
Post Office, Telegraph and Mint	..		2,466,175
Salaries and Expenses of Civil Departments	.. ..		14,835,209
Miscellaneous Civil Charges	.. ..		6,065,705
Famine Relief and Insurance	..		610,235
Construction of Railways (in addition to that under "Famine")	..		19,609
Railway Revenue Account	.. ..		23,592,649
Irrigation	.. ..		2,952,780
Buildings and Roads	.. .. ..		5,352,801
Army Services	.. ..		24,096,091
Special Defence Works	.. ..		217,867
Total	.. .. ..		95,055,179
Add and *Deduct* Provincial Surpluses and Deficits: (+ Rx. 193,912 and — Rx. 754,772)			— 560,860
Total charges against Revenue	..	Rx.	94,494,319

Corresponding Banking adjustments bring the total Expenditure to the same sum as the Revenue side of the account, but it should be noted that in this balance appears an item as follows:—"Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works—Rx. 4,446,421." This item is practically an addition to the debt, the *corpus* of which may be judged by the Rx. 5,124,017 devoted to pay the interest upon it.

The more the above General Account is studied the more confusing and unsatisfactory does the previous table of Net Revenue and Expenditure become as an informing account. After a comparison of several documents drawn up from varying points of view, it is found that Net in this little table means the difference between the Rx. 63,585,121 on the revenue side and the Rx. 9,722,041 given on the other side as "Direct demands on the Revenue," which we mark as referring to "principal heads of revenue." Leaving out of sight for the moment the official remark that "a clearer view of the financial condition" may be got from this table, we find that it is practically worthless as an indication of income raised from the taxpayer. The receipts from land revenue for 1894-5 are set down as Rx. 25,408,272, but on enquiry it is found that Rx. 4,048,132 is charged for general management. In the same way, as regards opium, out of Rx. 7,323,757 Rx. 1,616,105 went for management, and a false view of the financial position may be taken, as indeed of the general position, if so highly attenuated an abstract of net revenue and expenditure be regarded. It tends to draw attention from the vital matter of expenditure. It also loses sight of the deduction made from the people's resources for public purposes. A far better and much clearer view of income and expense is got from a return which was first prepared in 1894, at the instance of Sir Henry Fowler, similar to that which he suggested for the British accounts. This return for 1894-5, now to hand, seeks to give the net income and expenditure by deducting from the above gross amounts of Rx. 95,000,000 and Rx. 94,490,000 respectively the departmental receipts and disbursements together with certain refunds, assignments, etc., and the cost of preparing the opium, leaving the cost of the vast establishments of the land and opium revenue, together with that of other administrative departments in the account. The result of treating the above "general account" in this way may be seen as follows:

	Rx.		Rx.
REVENUE—Gross ..	95,187,429	EXPENDITURE—Gross	94,494,319
Deduct—Departmental Receipts	31,602,308	*Deduct* the same items as on other side, but add the Rx. 470,785 treated as Income	34,534,532
Total from "Principal Heads" ..	63,585,121		
Deduct—Refunds, etc., and Cost of Opium Cultivation ..	3,403,010		
	60,182,111		
Add—Net Miscellaneous Receipts	470,785		
Total Net Income .. Rx.	60,652,896	Total Net Expenditure .. Rx.	59,959,786

Such a result, adding over 13 per cent. to the figures of the other net statement, is a much fairer and better representation of income and expenditure, of the cost and burden of governing India apart from the departments contributing to revenue. No good object is served by making a distinction between revenue and income, making the first prominent, while the latter is partly hidden.

What then, is to be said of the "financial condition" of India? One must speak modestly, seeing that the much debated question is now being investigated in London by a Royal Commission. Also in this short inspection of a large and very complex question only the most general deductions can be given. The income and expenditure as a whole, regardless for the occasion of its relation to the different governments and dependencies of India in the field of observation. "The clear view of the financial position" of which the official speaks, which he gets by eliminating all but the money he gets into his hand from taxes after the establishment has been

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

paid for, may be clear, but it is very partial—wholly inadequate. "Financial condition" in his sense should be more properly called fiscal, a subject of great interest. "Financial condition" of India is another and a far larger, deeper, most profoundly important question. To divert attention from this larger prospect to the Government income from taxes and the land and opium revenue may be of use in estimating the fiscal condition of India. But surely it is on the surface of the question, that the services of the railways, post, and telegraphs, and the military department should be taken into account in estimating the financial condition of the Indian empire. "Apart from other considerations," we are told, the revenue and expenditure are "continually increasing through the opening of additional railways and canals" and so for the "clearer view" we had better confine our attention to the net figures given in the second table above. The "clearer view" seems intended for short-sighted persons. A vital question in estimating the condition from a financial point of view is to know something of the "other considerations" than the figures of the railways and canals. The "Fowler" Return enables us to give a few comparative figures. Looking to the *revenue* (apart from the departmental accounts) we find that since 1884-5 to 1894-5 the receipts have increased from Rx. 47,180,749 to Rx. 60,652,896, or 25 per cent. But of this opium, which was Rx. 5,849,140 in the former year, in 1894-5 had declined to Rx. 5,702,558. The receipts from land, forests, and tributary States increased from Rx.22,634,253 to Rx.26,670,177 or about 16½ per cent. The receipts from the taxes, as distinguished from land and opium revenue increased meanwhile from Rx.18,154,111 to Rx.27,809,376 or nearly 54 per cent. Of this last item the salt tax is a part showing an increase from Rx. 6,081,592 to Rx.8,291,929 or nearly 37 per cent. Customs rose from Rx.990,088 to Rx.3,757,433, or nearly 280 per cent. of increase. In like manner excise increased from Rx.3,953,064 to Rx.5,444,206, or about 39 per cent. Here we have a clue to the trend of affairs, for while population grew from 1881 to 1891, about 11½ per cent., the taxation grew in a decade from '84 to '95 by 54 per cent. Again turning to expenditure on the net basis of Sir Henry Fowler, we find in the same decade a total increase from Rx.47,180,749 to Rx. 59,959,786, or over 27 per cent. Analysing this again we find that of the commercial services, the post office, and the telegraphs now more than pay their way. Railways which in 1884-5 cost a net Rx. 1,051,751 to revenue, now involve a loss of Rx.2,348,489; and irrigation works which involved a loss of Rx.573,017 now require Rx.613,965. The annual expenditure to meet the interest on debt has risen from Rx.3,907,848 to Rx.4,308,955, or over 10 per cent., though it has meantime been less than the 1884-5 charge. The collection of revenue has grown from Rx.5,116,137 to Rx.6,319,031 or over 23 per cent. The net expense on the civil services went up from Rx.19,032,924 to Rx.22,313,571, over 17 per cent. On the military services, the net cost of which was Rx.17,057,865, there was spent in 1894-95 Rx.24,252,058, or over 42 per cent. Here also we get a further clue to the trend of affairs in India. It does not lie within the province of this paper to discuss the policy enshrined in this financial survey. But it is clear that it will not do to confine attention to the net abstracts of Indian finance if one is to get the "clearer view of the financial condition." Policy and expenditure, of course, have a determining influence on the condition of affairs. The contents of that policy as enshrined in the expenditure and the financial measures taken to meet it, are of the utmost importance in considering the general financial condition. From such an examination one comes forth with the conviction that much is necessary by way of examination of Indian affairs and that the Royal Commission was not appointed a moment too soon.

EDUCATION AT HIGH PRESSURE.

[FROM AN INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

The abuses exposed and the grievances ventilated in the columns of INDIA are many and varied, but none, I imagine, is more disastrous in its consequences than the system of higher education for which the University authorities in India are responsible. It is in some cases undermining the constitutions of the young, in others it unhinges their minds, and it finally produces a youth whose chief merit is superficiality, and who, after hard labour and incessant "cram" for eight to ten years, can scarcely be called an educated man.

The other day an official complained to me that a graduate whom he had but recently employed as clerk was unable to copy out an official letter without making a mistake in every other sentence he wrote, and as to conversing with him in English, he found that it saved time and temper if he carried on his conversation in the vernacular. I informed the official that his experience was by no means singular, as there was a large number of graduates to whom the same remarks might with truth be applied, but that very little blame attached to these men, for they were all the unfortunate victims of a system of education which could only be fitly described as monstrous. Not long ago a friend of mine who displayed keen anxiety that his son should have a distinguished career at the University came to me for advice. He was afraid the health of the young boy was being gradually undermined by arduous study. I could only put to my friend the two alternatives—(i) to give his son prolonged rest and give up the idea of his having a "brilliant career," or (ii) to be prepared to offer him a sacrifice to the pernicious system under which higher education is carried on in India. Unfortunately this was not an isolated case. Any Principal or Professor of a College will bear testimony to the fact that every year many promising students break down through overwork. Meantime, many of the hundreds who become full-fledged B.A.'s and M.A.'s are men in whom has been "crammed" a certain amount of superficial knowledge, pertaining to a large variety of subjects, without their having attained proficiency in any one of them. Nor would it be correct to say that their intellectual or thinking powers have been

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

greatly developed. Rather I should imagine that they have been stunted and dwarfed by the undue exercise of one faculty, for the memory is often developed to an extrordinary extent at the expense of the other faculties.

In India the Universities are merely examining bodies, or corporations for conferring degrees. They exercise no direct influence on the education and training of young men. The examiners may be most intellectual, amiable and high-minded men, but inasmuch as they never come into contact with the candidates, their influence is lost. It is the colleges which educate and train the young mind, and the professors and teachers if left unhampered can, and sometimes do, exercise a vast influence over the students. But unfortunately their hands are tied, their freedom of action is taken away. They are unable to instruct their pupils in the subjects which they consider are best suited to develop their minds and their morals, nor are they at liberty to devote to physical exercises such a portion of time as may seem desirable to them. The baneful influence of the University is over them. Students who join a particular college do not consider the excellence of the intellectual and moral training received there, but look upon it as a machine which will impart to them that amount of knowledge which will enable them to pass the various examinations. Even missionary colleges fulfil no better functions. An infinitesimal portion of the day's time is perhaps devoted to Scripture reading, but the rest is all "cram," "cram," and nothing but "cram," so as to enable the student to obtain his degree. Thus it happens that the University itself exercises no influence whatever on the youths who are being launched out into the world by hundreds every year, and, furthermore, prevents the colleges which come directly into contact with them from influencing these men as they might.

The blame lies at the door of the Universities. They have adopted a system of education which has few redeeming features in it, and which differs radically from the system of such Universities as Oxford and Cambridge. At these English Universities a student has to pass a preliminary examination in certain specified subjects which guarantee that, up to a certain standard, he has received a general education, which is to serve as a basis for his future studies. In India, the entrance examination may be said to correspond with the preliminary or previous examination. But when we proceed further the difference is marked. At the English Universities the student in his further course is allowed to select a particular branch of learning, and he devotes his energy specially to it. But the Universities in India have made it obligatory on every candidate for a degree to undergo an examination in a multiplicity of subjects which have no connexion with each other. For the ordinary B.A. degree a candidate must not only pass an examination in English literature but must also learn a second language (it may be either Persian, or Sanscrit, or Latin, or Greek), for which he has no taste. And where is the necessity for his cramming into his head a thick volume of history, or puzzling his brains with higher mathematics, when he would much rather devote his attention to philosophy and logic? Or if he desires to read law or medicine, he finds that he is unable to do so unless, after passing the entrance examination, he spends at least four years upon subjects which are useless to him. The absurdity of the system is still more striking when we take into consideration the fact that after a student has passed the entrance examination he is required to take a further course of two years, and to pass another examination called the First Examination in Arts, the subjects being English, literature, a second language, ordinary mathematics, history or higher mathematics, logic or sciences. This is a comprehensive range of subjects. But even then the University will not leave the unfortunate youth alone. He may say: "I now wish to devote myself exclusively to one branch of learning, and to take my degree in it. I have a taste for English literature, or for philosophy, or for history, or for mathematics. Let me apply all my energy to the acquirement of the knowledge relating to one special subject." The University says, "No, you must have another 'cram,' you must again take up half-a-dozen subjects, in which, if you obtain a certain proportion of marks, you will obtain a degree, and if you have the inclination, and time, and energy, to make a special study of any one of these subjects, and can obtain 50 per cent. of marks, you will be supposed to have passed in honours in that subject." The poor student proceeds. He knows that he could easily secure the requisite number of marks for honours in the subject of his choice, but he must try to "cram" his head with a variety of subjects, and if he cannot do it his further progress is absolutely arrested.

What is the net result of this system of education? A certain number of youths are either mentally or physically incapacitated from prosecuting their studies to the end, though some of them had given promise of being brilliant scholars in special subjects. These, of course, drop out of the running. The rest proceed and obtain a degree from the University. Is this degree a guarantee that the graduates are really educated men? Unfortunately, experience shows it to be otherwise. The degree is too often merely an indication that its owner has shown an aptitude for "cramming" into his head a certain number of facts and figures which have enabled him to secure a certain proportion of marks. A man who has a highly retentive memory is often successful, but he does not necessarily possess the most cultivated mind. Once the degree is obtained the graduate shows himself in his true colours. Here we come to the most lamentable fact of all. The majority of graduates, once they have obtained their degree, throw aside their books. They cultivated learning, not for love of it, but for the particular end they had in view. Once that end is attained, why should they worry themselves any more about books? The consequence is that in the course of two or three years they forget what they had learnt. They are launched upon the world with a degree, certainly, and with a superficial knowledge of a variety of subjects, but this knowledge is a diminishing quantity every day. Blame may be laid at the door of the graduates who adopt a line of conduct utterly

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

opposed to that pursued by really educated men, but the system of education must be intrinsically bad which, instead of encouraging a love of learning, infuses into the young mind an antipathy to it. Learning has been to most of these men like some nauseous medicine which has been poured down their throats in increasing doses. Once free from the necessity of taking it, no wonder they avoid it in the future.

In the course of a forty years' existence the Indian universities have not succeeded in producing any great specialist, and with the continuance of the present system the chances are very much against their ever being able to produce one. Within the last few months Mr. J. C. Bose, Professor of the Presidency College, has, it is true, earned a high reputation for his scientific discoveries. But he is a graduate of Cambridge University, where he received special training in science. Possibly if his educational career had been guided by one of the Indian universities, India would not even have produced one man whose original researches were destined to win the acknowledgment of scientific Europe.

THE HISTORY OF THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. J. DACOSTA writes: "The Transvaal affair having attracted much interest in India, I am led to believe that Mr. Garrett Fisher's 'Brief History of the Transvaal,' just published by Messrs. Chapman and Hall, will interest your Indian readers, as it throws light on the origin of the crisis through which that country has just passed, and may, among the conflicting views published on the subject, materially aid to prevent misconceptions. I venture, therefore, to send herewith a short summary of the book."

Appended is Mr. Dacosta's summary:

The author narrates how the Dutch landed in Table Bay in 1595, settled there as the Netherlands East India Company in 1602, were joined by Huguenots in 1685, and how, after two centuries, their lands were occupied by the English in 1795, when the great French revolution prevented the Dutch colonists receiving the support of their countrymen at home. In 1835, when the slaves were emancipated, the Dutch colonists (commonly known as "Boers," a word meaning "Farmers") were promised full compensation for the loss of their slaves; but the promise was not fulfilled and this, together with other wrongs suffered at the hands of the British Government, induced the Boers to emigrate into Natal which was then held by the Zulus. These warlike savages attacked and slew a great many of the Dutch emigrants; but the latter succeeded ultimately in establishing their Republic of Natalia and in breaking the power of the Zulus. Thereupon, English troops attacked the Republic and took possession of its territory on the ground that the Boers were British subjects, although the allegation was flatly denied by the Boers themselves. Large numbers of the latter, therefore, abandoned their farms, and, crossing the Orange river, founded in 1845 the village of Lydenburg. Those who had remained in Natal complained of great injustice suffered at the hands of the English officials, and Jacobus Pretorius, addressing the Cape Government on their behalf, offered to explain their grievances; but Sir Henry Pottinger, the Governor, refused to see him, and Pretorius then headed the final emigration from Natal.

In 1845 the Boers founded the South African Republic in the country between the Orange and Vaal rivers; when the English immediately proclaimed the Queen's sovereignty over that tract on the ground on which they had previously claimed the Boer territory in Natal. The tract was then invaded by English troops and officials; but Pretorius, at the head of a body of Boers, captured Bloemfontein and expelled the British resident. General Sir Harry Smith (surnamed the hero of Aliwal and Subraon), who was then Governor of Cape Colony, offered £1,000 for the apprehension of Pretorius; and, heading an English force, dispersed the Boers at Boomplatz, after a skirmish which he described as the most severe he had ever witnessed. Meanwhile the English Government offered £2,000 for Pretorius's head; his outlawry, however, was reversed in 1851 and he was invited to a conference to negotiate for the independence of the South African Republic. The Sand River Convention was the result: it conceded to the Boers the right to manage their affairs according to their own laws, and without British interference; and it guaranteed that no encroachment should be made by the British Government north of the river Vaal.

In 1853 Jacobus Pretorius died, and was succeeded by his son, Marthenus Pretorius, who resigned in 1872, T. F. Burger being elected President of the Republic. The town of Pretoria, named in honour of the deceased President, was founded in 1885.

Meanwhile neighbouring native tribes manifested hostility to the Boers, the Zulus from the South, the Amaswazis from the North, and Bechuana Chiefs from the West, while the Bapedi, led by Sekukuni, actually encroached on the Boer territory in 1876. The Volksraad sent a Commando to punish them, and Sekukuni was reduced to sue for peace.

The English Government then intimated that they would not consent to the South African Republic engaging in foreign military operations, and on the Republic curtly replying that they had a right to their territory, the Government sent troops for the annexation of the country, promising at the same time that, if the Boers submitted, they should have complete self-government and the maintenance of their laws. These promises, however, were not fulfilled, and the English occupation was followed by the imposition of taxes, the appointment of a packed State Council and a censorship of the Press. For two and a-half years every successive administrator made the same promises and failed to keep them. Moreover, an Executive Council and a Legislative Assembly entirely nominated by the English Government led once more to the cry for independence. A Boer deputation visited England to protest against the invasion of their country, and had several interviews with Lord Carnarvon, without, however, obtaining any distinct and direct answer. A monster petition was then sent to England, and the new Colonial Secre-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

tary, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, replied that in no circumstance would the Transvaal be given up, and that if the delegates would go home and wait, all their wrongs would be put right in the Government's good time. The delegates replied that, once for all, no reform short of complete independence would now content the Boers.

On their return Sir Bartle Frere repeated the promises of self-government in local affairs; but he was soon afterwards superseded by Sir Garnet Wolseley who, with Colonel Lanyon, subjected the Transvaal to military rule, and treated it as a conquered country. The Boers—exasperated at the conduct of their military governors with their "tall talk," declaring that "so long as the sun shone, England would rule the Transvaal," and their threat to "hang rebels who grumbled"—held in December, 1879, a meeting presided over by Pretorius, junior, at which it was declared that the people of the South African Republic had never been British subjects, and were determined not to be. The High Commissioner had Mr. Pretorius and his Secretary put in jail, and the Boers commenced to lay in supplies of powder and lead.

The Beaconsfield Ministry was drawing to a close. The affairs of the Transvaal were referred to in the Queen's Speech; and Lord Hartington, speaking on the address, declared that the annexation of the Transvaal had been sanctioned by the House under wrong impressions and incorrect information.

"If it be proved," he added, "that it is for the advantage of that district and for the peace of the whole community of South Africa that the Transvaal should continue to be governed by us, let it be so. But if, on the other hand, we find that it will be more advantageous and more honourable to restore the former government of that country, then I say that no false notion of dignity ought to stand in the way."

About the same time—on the 30th March, 1880—Mr. Gladstone said at Peebles that Lord Beaconsfield's acquisition of the Transvaal was worthless, and added:

"And I say that if it were as valuable as it is valueless, I would repudiate it, because it has been obtained by means dishonourable to our country."

But when he was, some weeks later, returned to power by a great majority, he said that,

"it was impossible to consider the matter as if it were presented for the first time, and that his judgment was that the Queen could not be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal."

The Government and the English settlers, who were rapidly increasing in number, were confident that the Boers would limit themselves to protests, and the warnings of Messrs. Kruger, Joubert, and Pretorius fell upon deaf ears. Col. Lanyon was instructed to enforce the full payment of taxes, and he claimed in addition all arrears from the time of Mr. Burger, and in many instances, more than was owing. The badgered Boers told the magistrates: "You will drive us to desperation." A man named Bezuidenhout was summoned in November, 1880, to pay a tax of £27 5s. which was double what he really owed; and he pleaded his readiness to pay what was due; but the plea was rejected and his waggon was attached. On the day fixed for the sale a number of Boers rescued the waggon; and Col. Lanyon having sent a military force to arrest the ringleaders, armed Boers defended them.

Early the next month the Boers held meetings at Paarde Kraal at which the Volksraad was restored and Kruger, Joubert, and Pretorious were appointed to adminster the provisional Government until independence should be assured by arms. They wrote a letter to Sir Owen Lanyon saying:

"We solemnly declare that we have no desire to shed blood. It lies in your hands to force us to appeal to arms in self-defence. Should it come so far, we shall defend ourselves with the knowledge that we are fighting for the honour of her Majesty the Queen; for we fight for the sanctity of the treaties sworn to by her but broken by her officers."

The proclamation which accompanied this letter repeated that the Boers had never been subjects of her Majesty and never would be. Colonel Lanyon immediately telegraphed for more troops, each man to carry 70 to 100 rounds of ammunition. On the 16th December a party of Boers insulted the English garrison at Potchefstroom, and the force sent to drive them off was fired upon, besieged and cut off from communication with Pretoria and elswhere. Then speedily followed the worst blow that befell English arms since the day of Islandlwana. A detachment of the 94th regiment ordered up from Middleburg was attacked at Bronkhurst Spruit on the 19th, and in less than ten minutes half the force was *hors de combat* and the rest surrendered. Colonel Lanyon was shut in Pretoria. Sir George Colley, who marched at the head of 1,400 men, met the Boers at Laing's Nek, and delivered an attack which failed in consequence of the terribly accurate fire of the defenders. The English drew off with a heavy loss, and tried the next day to work round the Ingogo plateau; but the superior marksmanship of the Boers compelled them to steal back under cover of night, leaving their wounded at the mercy of the enemy.

Sir Evelyn Wood then brought up reinforcements, and a third method of attack was tried. Half the force marched in the night to the top of the Majuba Hill with a view to render the position of the Boers untenable. At dawn, however, when the Boers saw the red-coats 2,000 feet above them, some began to climb the precipitous face of the Majuba, while others kept up a long range fire at everything that showed over the brow of the hill. Finally the Boers reached the hollow crown of the Majuba, and engaged the English at a distance of 40 yards, when the English troops wavered, broke, and in a minute were running for life down the side of the mountain. General Colley was down with a bullet in his brain. The English then came to terms and, in an armistice concluded on March 21, 1881, they agreed to evacuate the Transvaal and to acknowledge its independence, reserving a right of sovereignty that should be settled on terms satisfactory to the Boers. The Pretoria Convention signed on August 3, 1881, was, however replaced by the Convention of London ratified in August, 1884. The claim of suzerainty was not maintained; but a right was reserved for the British Government to disapprove within six months any treaty which the South African Republic might conclude with a foreign nation or a native tribe and which the British Government considered as

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

contrary to the interests of her Majesty's possessions in South Africa.

Gold was discovered on the Kaap and Witwatersrand in 1885. Johannesburg was founded in December, 1886. The population of the Transvaal was estimated in December, 1894, by Sir Jacobus de Wet, the English agent in Pretoria, at 71,000 Boers, 63,000 British subjects, and 16,000 other aliens.

The Executive of the Transvaal Government consists of a President elected by the Burghers for five years, with a Council composed of the State Secretary, the Commandant General and the Secretary, and of three non-official members elected by the Volksraad. The legislative authority is in the hands of the popularly elected Volksraad. Burghers may vote in the election of the Volksraad and sit in it. Foreigners, thirty years of age, may become naturalised citizens, after four years of residence, by taking the oath of allegiance, provided that they are members of a Protestant Church.

INDIAN IDEALS.[1]

Was it not Professor Max Müller who once applied to religions the saying that "he who only knows his own language knows none"? Certainly there is an important sense in which it is true of religions. He who knows only his own religion may have a rule of conduct, a faith to live and die by, but he can give no reason for the faith that is in him, is in no position to form a sound intellectual judgment on his creed. And if even for the refining and purifying, the placing on a sounder foundation, of a man's own belief, the study of religions is desirable, it becomes still more desirable if he wants to understand men and nations brought up under the influence of other creeds. More than half the uncharitable judgments of the world, it has been finely said, are due to a deficiency of imagination. Yet, of those who are brought into contact with other races, how few take the necessary steps for the cultivation of a defective imagination by the patient study of an alien religion, by an honest endeavour to place themselves at the point of view of its adherents. If missionaries, for instance, were always to do this, there would have been no need for Mr. Sturdy's indignant protest on the misuse of a debased interpretation of the allegory of Krisna and the shepherdesses as a weapon of hostile criticism against Hindu religions.

"We may safely assert that none of these have read the original, but merely sought some means to destroy other people's religion in order to advocate their own. Time might better be employed in pointing out the original intention of the allegory, by which they would elevate both themselves and the people with whom they come in contact. By taking the other attitude they confirm the pariah in his ignorance, stimulate his resentment, and stand as the enemies of Krisna the Divine. Love is one, whether it be called that of Christ, Krisna, or any other individualised expression of Truth. . . . . The love of Krisna is deep in the Hindu heart, and cannot be thus slighted with impunity. Yet under all these irritations the Hindu has yet to be found who would retort by any insult or criticism of the founder of Christianity. To the Hindu such criticism of the pure and noble of any race or age is a dreadful crime, involving far-reaching retributive effects. It is a pity we do not think the same." (P. 32-3).

No Christian could study "Nârada Sûtra" without gaining a new sympathy, a new and strange sense of kinship, with those who through many generations have regarded these maxims as divine. "Love is surrendering all actions to God, and feeling the greatest misery in forgetting God" (§ 19). "Being praised, God manifests himself soon and makes himself felt by his worshippers" (§ 80). "In all times (past, present, and future) Love is the greatest thing" (§ 81). The voices that the Indian has heard in the East are mysteriously like those that have spoken to the Western peoples. It may be that the Christian reader will even be tempted to lay too much stress on the likeness; for, though Mr. Sturdy speaks of the opposition that is excited by doctrines new and strange, there is a subtle fascination for many minds in these oracles from a distant shrine, the fascination of a familiar tone heard by the traveller in a far country.

Mr. Sturdy's object in translating "Nârada Sûtra" is to win the attention of English readers for the Indian doctrine of *Bhakti Yoga*, "Salvation by Love and Devotion." We gather that he is in strong sympathy with Swâmi Vivekânanda, the accomplished Yogi who is at present lecturing in England on Indian metaphysics, and who claims to teach a philosophy that can serve as a basis to any religious system. "I direct my attention," the Swâmi is quoted as saying, "to the individual, to teach him that he himself is divine, and I call upon men to make themselves conscious of this divinity within"; and again, "I teach only the Self, hidden in the heart of every individual, and common to all. A handful of strong men knowing that Self and living in its light would revolutionise the world, even to-day, as has been the case by single strong men before, each in his day." One cannot but hope that this little series will reach a wider circle of students than has been touched by the "Sacred Books of the East," or by Professor Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures of 1878, and penetrate more deeply, if less widely, than Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of Asia." Perhaps in future volumes of the series a little more help in the way of a historical introduction might be given to the ignorant but interested Western reader. It is not, however, for the translation alone that we owe something to Mr. Sturdy. It would be ungrateful to pass over in silence the extreme beauty of parts of his commentary. Here is one fine saying: "He who loves equally everywhere need seek no asceticism: it will seek him as long as he has a coin to spend, a loaf to divide or a coat to give" (p. 27). And here is another: "No religious system pretends to define Deity; it can at the best strive with other systems to suspend some intellectual or emotional veil through which, in shining, the light may take form" (p. 44). A still nobler passage, on the "lonely places" in the depths of the heart (p. 42), is too long to quote. The saying (p. 8), "The aspiration to realisation hardly enters the minds of modern Western people," should give food for reflec-

[1] "Nârada Sûtra: An Inquiry into Love." Translated from the Sanskrit, with an independent Commentary. By E. T. Sturdy. "Indian Ideals," No. I. (London: Longmans, Green and Co.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

tion to sincere believers in Christianity. More doubtful is the assertion (p. 7) that "the great possibility of realisation was, to a great extent, destroyed for Christianity with the decay of the monastic system." Realisation in the world, rather than realisation outside of it, was surely the ideal of Christ and his apostles.

UNIVERSITY REFORM IN INDIA.

Dr. W. H. Wilson contributes to a recent issue of the *Madras Review* an important article on University Reform. Attempts are being made by a small but resolute section of the Senate of Madras University to introduce very necessary reforms in the administration of University affairs. "There are," writes Dr. Wilson, "three points on which these gentlemen particularly insist; and the first of these is the necessity of Fellows, if they are to discharge the duties of their office, being kept informed on all matters concerning the University. This object they propose to attain by printing and distributing to the Fellows of the University the minutes of all meetings of the Senate, the Faculties, and the Syndicate, as is done in the Universities of Calcutta and Allahabad. The second is to make the Syndicate a more representative body than it is at present, and better fitted to discharge the important duties entrusted to it. The attainment of this object, no doubt, presents great difficulties, and to secure it fully many deep-seated and radical changes will be necessary. The only change now proposed consists in merely increasing the strength of the Syndicate from eight elected members to eleven, and so bringing it up to the level of the corresponding bodies in Calcutta and Bombay. It is, perhaps, scarcely to be expected that any great improvement will result from this change, but it will, it is hoped, have the effect of making further reforms easier in the future. The last of the three reforms is one of great importance in the practical administration of University affairs. It is the proposal to define the relations between the Senate and the Syndicate, and to require the latter body to recognise its responsibility to the former. To say that the relations between the two bodies are at present ill-defined is to understate the case; they are simply not defined at all: the result being that disputes are constantly arising, and the right of the Syndicate to exercise specific powers constantly being challenged."

Dr. Wilson next gives a sketch of the history and relations to one another of the three older Indian Universities, situated in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and of all three to their English prototype, the University of London. It is well known that these three institutions were all founded in the same year, under precisely similar Acts of Incorporation, and were modelled on the lines of London University. Dr. Wilson shows clearly that while London University has adapted itself to the requirements of the age, the Indian Universities stand grievously in need of reform. His proposals for them may be summarised thus:—

1. The incorporation of the graduates into a body having a definite legal status in the University.
2. The institution of a number of Standing Committees of the Senate for specified purposes.
3. The enlargement of the syndicate and alterations in the manner of electing it.
4. The publication of minutes of the proceedings of Senate, Syndicate, and Faculties.
5. The introduction of proxy-voting at elections.
6. The abolition of the rule requiring members of the Syndicate to reside in Madras, and its corollary, the introduction of a rule making retention of office conditional upon attendance at a certain proportion of meetings.
7. The increase of the number of statutory meetings of the Senate (exclusive of the Convocation for conferring degrees) from one to three or four; the said meetings to be held preferably on Saturdays, in order that the largest possible number of Fellows may be enabled to attend.

"These proposals, it will be noticed, all have reference to the government and administration of the University, for the previously stated reason, that these reforms must precede all others. The hands of the Syndicate are already more than full in carrying on the current business of the University, and it has not the time, even had it the inclination, to engage in projects for reform in the various directions in which it is necessary. And for a private member of the Senate, or even a considerable number of such members, to attempt what the Syndicate disapproves of, (and, generally speaking, it disapproves of every proposal which does not emanate from itself) is to court failure.

"Space forbids my entering on the present occasion upon the consideration of the many other reforms of the necessity for which an intimate acquaintance with the University for over twenty years has convinced me, and I shall therefore confine myself to the mere mention of two which are specially pressing. One of these is measures for securing a much greater degree of accuracy and efficiency in valuing examination papers, particularly at the lower examinations, than exists at present. It is no exaggeration to say that, under the present system, or want of it, it is a toss up whether a large percentage of the candidates for matriculation fail or whether they pass. Another is the proper recognition of science as a branch of study and its complete separation at a certain stage from linguistic studies. Every attempt to combine such different subjects in any course of moderate length has failed and must always fail, and the chief result of the Madras University's efforts in this direction is the wholesale manufacture of graduates who know little English and less science."

Presiding over a meeting of the East India Association, held at Westminster Town-hall on June 23rd, Sir Lepel Griffen said that "on the one question which was now before the English and Indian world—namely, the payment by India or by England of the troops employed in the Sudan—he thought no person who was a true friend of India and who wished well to the British Government at home could possibly be silent. If the honour of England and the English people were to be considered the question could only be decided in one way. So long as Indian troops were employed in Africa on work which was entirely outside those duties which were laid down in the India Act for the legitimate employment of Indian troops out of Indian revenues, they should be paid the whole of their ordinary pay and the whole of the extraordinary expenses, and not one rupee should be charged to the revenues of India. The matter was one of very great importance, and the honour of England was distinctly involved."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to MR. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JULY, 1896.

THE DETECTIVE AS JUDGE.

WE understand that an important Memorial will shortly be presented to the Secretary of State for India, praying for the separation of judicial and executive functions in the territories whose welfare he is appointed to protect. The wonder to English minds must be not that this separation is asked for, but that the union of functions so essentially incompatible should ever have been made. It is, no doubt, true that the Homeric king was priest and lawgiver as well as leader in war. But Lord George Hamilton will hardly contend that British rule in India is supposed to conform to the Homeric type. The history of the question, which repeated exposition has long since made familiar throughout India, shows that, in theory at any rate, the Government of India has on many occasions admitted the unreasonableness, and therefore the peril, of uniting in one and the same officer the functions and duties of detective and magistrate, public prosecutor and criminal judge, revenue collector and revenue judge in appeal. Indeed, the Government of India, that we may do it justice, has gone further than the academic recognition of an abstract truth. A century ago—in 1793—actual steps were taken in the time of Lord Cornwallis to terminate the travesty of justice by which a revenue officer in India adjudicated on appeals from his own assessments. The Government then observed, in a commendable platitude, that it, "must divest itself of "the power of infringing in its executive capacity "the rights and privileges which, as exercising the "legislative authority, it has conferred on the "landholders," or, in other words, that "the "revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial "powers." In the sixty years which elapsed between that period and the Indian Mutiny it is not difficult to trace a growing inclination on the part of high officials to terminate the union of functions which ought always to have been distinguished. But it would seem that the Mutiny set back the hands of the clock. It is, indeed, possible to cite many authoritative expressions of opinion since 1859—notably the report of the Police Commission, and the speeches on the Police Bill, in 1860—in favour of separation. But the Government of India became stiff-necked. A reform which was approved in principle was delayed in practice. More than that, executive interference with the judiciary began to grow, and within recent years, as Sir Richard Garth and Mr. J. Dacosta have so clearly shown, this interference has developed to an intolerable extent. The Courts and the executive have come into scarcely veiled conflict, revenue officers have been granted special privileges and exemptions, and the right of District Magistrates to tamper with the judicial independence of subordinate magistrates has been openly stated and recommended in the highest executive quarters. This is a deplorable state of things, which the separation of judicial from executive duties cannot, of course, wholly remedy. But it will be a long step in the right direction, and it ought to be taken without further delay.

The members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee are themselves well qualified to lay before the Secretary of State some account of the evils which are inseparable from the present system, and to request the only possible remedy. A man need not be a retired Anglo-Indian, nor a lawyer, in order to discern the unfitness of a detective to act as a judge. But the Indian Parliamentary Committee may nevertheless strengthen its hands by securing the co-operation of some of the eminent legal authorities who, in our columns and elsewhere, have borne testimony to the need of reform. Men like Sir Richard Garth, who was Chief Justice of Bengal, Lord Hobhouse, who was Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council from 1872 to 1877, and Sir J. Budd Phear, who was Chief Justice of Ceylon, will lend to the representations of the Indian Parliamentary Committee a weight that the India Office will not easily resist. The burden of the present grievance consists in the anomalous position of Collector-Magistrates. These complacent pluralists are at once, as Sir W. W. Hunter says, both fiscal officers, charged with the collection of the revenue from the land and other sources, and revenue and criminal judges of first instance and in appeal. They have besides a formidable array of miscellaneous duties, which include, together with such trifles as the superintendence of education and sanitation, the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

control and direction of the police. Sir J. P. Grant in 1857 pointed out, as Sir Frederick Halliday had done before, and as Sir Barnes Peacock and Sir Bartle Frere did afterwards, the monstrous absurdity of supposing that any officer, after putting his wits to the utmost stretch in order to beat his adversary in the game of detection, could then sit down to try as a dispassionate judge, upon the evidence given in court, the question whether he or his adversary had won the game. Sir J. P. Grant added that one or two cases of this sort would excite as much indignation as would save him the necessity of argument *a priori* against the combination theory. The cases have occurred, the indignation has been excited, but the combination system is permitted to remain. There are two ways in which a District Magistrate may now be responsible for a judicial scandal. He may himself try a criminal case in which he has directed the operations of the police, or received information from them. Or he may assign the case to a subordinate magistrate within his control and, by means of private communications which are known colloquially as "demi-official chits," inform his subordinate how he expects the case to end. This second method is, it seems to us, rather worse than the first. The mischief of the present system is not merely that it is responsible for palpable miscarriages of justice, but that it affords opportunities for suspicion and recrimination where substantial justice is done. The Maimansingh case, which in May, 1893, gave rise to an important debate on the whole question in the House of Lords, is but a recent and conspicuous example to which only too frequent parallels can be found. Mr. Manomohan Ghose, whose exertions to secure the separation of the two sets of functions are beyond all praise, has compiled an authentic catalogue of cases which are enough to make an Englishman's hair stand on end in mingled astonishment and indignation.

It is, of course, upon the proved fact that the combination of judicial and executive duties in the same officer has frequently led to grave scandals that the advocates of separation chiefly rely. A District Magistrate would need to be more, or less, than human in order to discharge adequately his varied and incompatible functions. As an executive officer he is bound to keep his ears open to reports which he may turn to account in the interests of his District. Needless to say, such a habit is diametrically opposed to the judicial rigour which excludes information that is not given in court in accordance with the rules of evidence. Nor would it be easy to over-estimate the mischief to which, under the present system, the lack of professional training and knowledge in the judicial officer gives rise. Mr. Gladstone once said that a man of forty could no more be made into a member of Parliament than a woman of forty could be made into a ballet-girl. The proper mode of taking evidence, and of ascertaining fact by the *viva voce* examination and cross-examination of witnesses, is not, to put it gently, an accomplishment which comes to every man by nature. It can be acquired only by careful study and long practice. It is, indeed, a business in itself, and it is ridiculous to suppose that a man whose aim, ambition, and principal work lie in the executive department can also discharge, even with the most moderate success, the special and exacting duties of a judicial office. It is, we repeat, difficult to perceive upon what grounds sensible and fair-minded men can defend the existing system. Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross, who have both been Secretaries of State for India, and, as Lord George Hamilton would probably be the first to admit, know a good deal more about India than he does, make no pretence of defending the existing system. They merely allege that, in the present state of Indian finance, the cost of reform is prohibitive. But that allegation, since it was made, has been fully met and disposed of in our columns by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, Commissioner of the Orissa Division, who, speaking with expert knowledge of the offices concerned, declared and, as we think, satisfactorily showed that the cost of separation would be nothing at all. We await with some interest Lord G. Hamilton's reply to the Memorial. Having retained Chitral, will he plead the financial difficulty? Or will he have the courage openly to adduce the "prestige" argument, which simply means that District Magistrates of a certain type are anxious to remain as formidable, and as much like an ancient Oriental despot, as possible without the Oriental despot's knowledge of his people? In any case the Secretary of State will find it hard to refuse a request that the Government of India may be instructed to report upon the subject.

A COMPLACENT PHILOSOPHER.[1]

IT has been said, not without truth, that the hope of the present age is bound up with its middle-aged men, whose cheery view of life is in marked contrast with the gloomy pessimism of the youth of the period. Had the writer of a very able article on this topic in the now extinct *Universal Review* been acquainted with the papers from Sir Edwin Arnold's pen published in book form under the title of "East and West," he would no doubt have referred to them for illustrations of his theory. The range of the articles now collected for the first time is not less wide than the title claims. They cover many lands from Birmingham to Tokio, and various topics, from Buddhism to limpets. But a common thread appears in the most important of the papers, in the shape of a somewhat veiled exposition of a new creed, which is darkly hinted at in the address on "Aspects of Life" delivered to a Birmingham audience three years ago, and vaguely outlined in "Astronomy and Religion," "Love the Preserver," and other articles. Examined critically, this "Religio Magistri," if, following a current fashion, we may label it as the distinctive property of its creator, will be found to consist of fragments of religions, old and new, set in a background of general cheerfulness and complacency. Fragments of Christianity, large blocks of Buddhism, a trace here and there of Aristotelian, Platonic, and even Neo-Kantian

[1] "East and West." Being papers reprinted from the *Daily Telegraph* and other sources, by Sir Edwin Arnold. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1896. Price, 18s.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

doctrines, all find a place in the general mosaic, bound together by a cement of placid optimism. It is the creed, if creed it can be called, for opinion and sentiment supply the place of belief, of a man brought up in Christianity, and trained in Oxford philosophical teaching, whose imagination has been stimulated by the teeming life of the East, and whose mind has been quick to note the curious anticipation in Buddhist theories of some of the doctrines of Greek philosophy, and even of the later developments of the Darwinian theory. Sir Edwin Arnold's genius tends to synthesis rather than analysis, and he is less concerned to observe the incongruities of life and its apparently inextricable confusion and contradiction than to trace a principle of harmony underlying the discord, and controlling in a beneficent manner the evolution of the race. So he would appear to connect as different aspects of the same truth doctrines so widely divergent in point of time and origin as Darwinism, the Buddhist doctrine of continuity of life, and the Lucretian and Neo-Kantian doctrine of the universal intelligence. In his defence of the cosmic process he joins issue with Professor Huxley, who in his famous Romanes lecture at Oxford four years ago, maintained that "the ethical progress of society depends not on "imitating the cosmic process, but on combating it." On this Sir Edwin Arnold remarks that, "so luminous "a mind certainly overlooked the fact that the ethical "faculty and the ethical ideal, which he contrasted "with the course of nature, have likewise come by "evolution, forth from the cosmic process." But this is exactly the point at issue between evolution and its opponents, who stoutly deny the applicability of the doctrine to ethical faculties and relations, however great its probability as a theory of physical existence.

From another point of view the author's creed is the creed of a man who has lived a full life, and whose work has been crowned with success, and has gained the meed of public and official recognition which so much good work must perforce miss. "I "have found life" he says, "in the highest degree "charming and interesting, and this notwithstand- "ing an ample share of what are styled — some- "times I think a little too querulously—its pains "and sorrows. I come back glad to have lived, "well satisfied with my share in the world." Here is the explanation of the optimism that forms the basis of Sir Edwin Arnold's teaching. Thus it is that after a long residence in India he is enabled to ask light-heartedly, "As to the 'sin and misery' "business, however, is it not now-a-days absurdly "exaggerated"? to allude to "the universal wil- "lingness to live," and to support his contentions by numerous quotations from "The Light of Asia." "Willingness to live" is after all only our old friend the instinct of self-preservation masquerading in a new dress, and what can be the value of an argument based on a universal instinct? In the essay entitled "Love the Preserver" it is suggested that the maternal instinct has its origin in "a far-off "real personal interest in lives beyond the mother's "life," and emphasis is laid on the strength of an interest which can overcome the self-preservative instinct. Following this example we cannot be wrong in laying a corresponding stress on the not unfrequent willingness to die, illustrated as it is by the daily records of self-destruction. With Sir Edwin Arnold's views in the main we willingly concur. Pessimism is an unsatisfactory creed, and, as he says, "from the lowest point of view hope is "very cheap and gladness acts as a sovereign "medicine." But there is a middle course between pessimism and the wilful disregard of the darker side of things. Satisfaction with the average conditions of life is easy when one is on the right side of the average, but no amount of argument deduced from statistics can console the unfortunate individual on the wrong side of the middle line. Side by side with a hopeful view of the destiny of mankind there is room for the "divine discontent" that seldom invades the official mind, and Sir Edwin Arnold inclines to the official view. "How beneficent our "government of India is, was well shown in those "dark days of the famine." True; but nothing is so potent to efface the memory of great benefits as a series of petty injustices, of which the starvation of the famine fund may justly be reckoned one. "It "is before all things necessary that the British "people should comprehend the Imperial importance "of India, and be very resolute amid all political "changes not to suffer for one moment that the strong "hand of the Queen's Viceroy at Calcutta shall be "weakened by ignorant theorists, and the breathless "benevolence of globe-trotting politicians," nor, we might add, by the short-sighted optimism and nescience of officials at the India Office.

From a literary point of view the book merits little but praise. Its contents reach a much higher standard of excellence than one is accustomed to associate with special articles in journals or magazines. Inconclusive and unscientific as are the speculations of the author in the realm of religion and philosophy they are none the less, but rather on that account more, interesting and readable. His publishers, too, have spared no pains to prepossess the reader in his favour. Type, plates, paper, and binding leave nothing to be desired. Moreover, the volume possesses in a high degree that quality of handiness which is so dear to the heart of the book-lover, a quality independent of mere weight or size, and the outcome of a due proportion between shape, size, and weight. But apart from such meretricious aids to charm, the experiences of a traveller like Sir Edwin Arnold could hardly fail to be attractive if well told. And Sir Edwin Arnold tells a tale well, even when he himself is the central figure. He relates many charming little anecdotes in a delightful manner, and adorns nearly everything he touches. It is doubtful, however, whether the expansion of Herodotus's tale about the treasure house of Rhampsinitus is any improvement upon the original. The father of history is himself the prince of *raconteurs*, and to try to amend his tales at any rate is an undertaking from which no man can expect to emerge successful. Much more valuable are the records of personal experience, such as the papers entitled "The "Two Bridges," and "An Engine of Fate," or the discursive and appreciative treatment of Oriental topics like "The Indian Woods" and "The Sword of "Japan." Especially noteworthy, clothing with flesh

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and blood the dry bones of statistics in the "Official "Abstract" under the head of "Wild Beasts," is the series of papers on "Jungle Kingdoms," wherein are reproduced the interesting features of that perpetual warfare between man and beast which the statistics indicate. One of these papers is marred by what, perhaps, may be regarded, without hypercriticism, as an error of taste. Speaking of an attempt to tame a couple of hyaena cubs the author says: "Both came to a melancholy and "violent end, having developed with their molar teeth "a taste for native babies." It is ill jesting where another's suffering is involved, especially where there is an inequality in station and power. Together with this lack of sympathy which, from time to time, strikes a jarring note, Sir Edwin Arnold appears to have imbibed some other prejudices of the governing clique during his residence in India. For when in jest Lord Dufferin, on bidding him farewell, asked what he could do for him "even unto the half of his kingdom," he could think of no worthier boon for the people amongst whom he had lived and worked than a railway to Kandahar.

THE FINANCIAL PERIL.[1]

THIS unpretending pamphlet of 32 pages is worthy of more attention at the present moment than many a volume ten or twenty times its size. It professes to be, and it is, a dispassionate survey of the position of Indian finance, and it "reveals a state of things almost bordering on the desperate."

A DESPERATE SITUATION.

What Professor Murison indicated by suggestion in his article on the Indian Budget in our last month's issue is expressed by the author in frank terms:

"Such is the situation—desperate and full of peril—with which we have to grapple. Revenue and expenditure, no doubt, balance each other, and according to European tests, the financial equilibrium so established is a decisive proof of the soundness of the system—a view of the position which Lord George Hamilton evidently holds. But such are the conditions of Government and administration in this country that in this very balanced position of the national finances—on which the Secretary of State congratulates us—there lurks *grave danger* to which we ought no longer to shut our eyes."

The full and searching analysis of the accounts, which forms the substance of the pamphlet, abundantly justifies the author's conclusions, and corroborates the contentions that have been steadily pressed in these pages.

THE COST OF TERRITORIAL EXTENSION.

Thus, after a review of the military expeditions of the last dozen years, with their enormous expansion of territorial liabilities, the author asks:

"Was all such territorial extension at all necessary for the purpose? Was it necessary to advance the bounds of the Empire so far into the wilds and deserts of Mid-Asia and East Africa? Was it not possible to avoid so large an extension of administrative and diplomatic liabilities, consistently with the obligations of national safety? . . . . The new policy and its results, so far as may be judged from present indications, leave the diplomatic and military situation, we fear, distinctly worse and weaker than it was twelve years ago. But our present concern is only with the financial aspects of these so-called 'defensive' measures of the past twelve years, and we have here only to take note of the fact that they have entailed on the country a total expenditure of 67·8 crores and a net addition of 6·38 crores to its annual expenditure."

RAILWAY EXTENSION: FINANCIAL LOSS.

"The vigorous prosecution of railway construction has, partly owing to the falling exchange and partly because several of the new lines are strategic only, largely increased the net loss to the State during the period. The loss in 1883-84 was only 30 lakhs; it is now in the current year 2·149 crores. The aggregate loss on this account in excess over the figure for 1883-84 comes up to 14·4 crores."

DISCONTENT AND DISSATISFACTION.

With fresh extensions, the loss must go on increasing—unless the accident of improved exchange comes in to save the situation. The exchange compensation to the European Services is placed in painful dramatic balance with the increased Salt revenue. "The consumption of this prime necessity of life is now 26 lakhs of maunds short of the normal—which means that 80 millions and more of our struggling poor, who alone cannot afford to buy enough salt when it is dear, are forced to cut down their supply by 3 lbs. per head."

"The reckless policy of a practically irresponsible and despotic bureau is permitted to determine the expenditure of the Empire, and the expenditure so established is made to determine the level of public taxation, *which, however, does not bear any normal relation to the tax-paying capacity of the people.* . . . . Everyone with disquieting anxiety waits to see what may be the next turn of the fiscal screw. Further, among the more intelligent classes in the country there is an increasing sense of keen discontent and dissatisfaction at the way in which all this money, so squeezed out, is so recklessly squandered away amidst the inaccessible wilds and sandy deserts, far away outside the limits of the country; and, indeed, it is impossible to hold one's patience when one finds that the unfortunate country is being so ruthlessly bled—for the purpose of extending the benefits of civilised rule to semi-barbarous tribes inhabiting the wild border-lands of the Empire."

The author justly points out that "it is the system—the entire financial management of the country—which is responsible for the present difficulties; and, unless there is a change—a radical change in the system—the root of the evil will remain untouched. It is the machinery, and not the product nor its working agents, on which we have to concentrate our attention."

WANTED: EFFECTIVE CONTROL.

What is wanted is, on the testimony of such men as Professor Fawcett, Sir David Barbour, and Sir Auckland Colvin, a really effective control over expenditure, the existing safeguards having proved illusory and the constitutional machinery being apparently altogether inadequate. We hope that this pamphlet will be widely read and studied in England, as well as in India.

[1] "The Present Financial Situation: A Grave Crisis." Poona: Printed at the Arya-Bhushana Press. 1896.

The July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* contains articles by Captain Frank E. Younghusband on "India and Africa," Alexander Rogers on "Rayatwari Settlements in India," and B. H. Baden-Powell on "Tribal Law in the Punjab."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Government's withdrawal of the Education Bill, which Mr. Balfour announced on June 22nd, will have the effect of relieving the congestion of business in the House of Commons. It ought, therefore, to make it comparatively easy for Mr. Balfour to fulfil his promise—given at the close of the recent debate on the cotton duties—to bring on the Indian Budget at an early day, and allow time, not indeed for adequate discussion, but for less meagre discussion than usual.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure continues its sittings at the India Office, but without admitting the public or representatives of the press. It is rumoured, however, that in this respect the precedent of the Liquor Licensing Laws Commission, to which we called attention last month, may be followed. There is also ground for believing that an *interim* report may shortly be issued, and a volume containing the first portion of the evidence.

At the annual meeting of the General Council of the National Reform Union, which was held in the Memorial Hall, Manchester, on June 17th, Sir W. Wedderburn delivered a short speech on Indian affairs. He said that "it always gave him great pleasure to speak on behalf of India to a Lancashire audience, because Lancashire had a predominant influence over the fortunes of India, and in the second place, because he believed the interests of Lancashire and those of India, if properly understood, would be found to be identical. India was a great national inheritance—an inheritance that should be used for the credit and advantage both of Great Britain and India itself. In order that that might be done it was absolutely necessary that there should be an effective national control over Indian affairs, and in his opinion that control ought to be of a financial character, and must be exercised by the House of Commons. (Cheers.) When we looked at what had been going on in late years we did not find that Indian affairs had been administered in a way to improve the good name of this country. He especially reminded them of the case of the waste from the Chitral war. (Hear, hear.) By the expedition to Chitral we had done no good but a great deal of harm to India by breaking down the barrier of mountains that separated India from Russia, and killing and dispersing the brave natives who manned these ramparts. (Hear, hear.) We promised these tribes to retire from the mountains when we rescued our garrison, but we had broken a pledge made before the world. That was not the way to increase our reputation either for wisdom or honesty. (Hear, hear.)"

"Then," continued Sir W. Wedderburn, "there was this new matter of sending Indian troops to Suakin. No one knew the object in going to the Sudan, but certainly it was not to do India any good. It was proposed to make the Indians pay for the troops—an unjust and unwarrantable act. He believed the sense of justice of the British people would not permit of this thing being done. The result of all the waste and extravagance that was going on was that the people of India were frightfully overtaxed, paying a heavier taxation than any other people in the world. For a pennyworth of salt the Indian had to pay forty pence. And now the Government had placed the duties upon imports into India, which had so much interfered with trade and caused so much dissatisfaction throughout the country. India ought really to be a gold mine to us, but instead of getting dividends from it we only got calls. Sir William complained that there was no discussion of the Indian Budget, and urged that a small committee of members should make themselves understand the figures and make them clear to the House. The native Indians in the Viceroy's Council should also be encouraged to discuss the Budget." (Hear, hear.) Sir W. Wedderburn also spoke at the evening meeting in the Free Trade Hall which was addressed by Mr. John Morley.

On Saturday afternoon, June 12th, a special meeting of the London Indian Society was held at Montague Mansions, Bloomsbury, in order to consider the circumstances of the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan expedition. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who presided, said that the occasion was one equally of congratulation and complaint, the ground of congratulation being that the complaint would lead to a general awakening of British opinion with regard to the inequalities of the administration in India. He was fully impressed with the general benefits of English rule, but he trusted that the evident injustice of charging the Indian revenues with the cost of Indian troops in the Sudan would lead to a just appreciation of other grievances of which the natives of India had to complain. A resolution to the effect that no part of any expenditure, ordinary or extraordinary, incurred in employing Indian troops in the Sudan expedition should be charged upon the Indian revenues was agreed to.

In connexion with the discussion as to who shall pay for the Indian troops employed at Suakin, it is worth while (wrote the *St. James's Gazette* on June 10th) to note what India pays for the British troops employed in India. In the first place, the whole cost of the troops from the time they leave England to the time they return is borne by the Indian Government. In addition various payments are made to the British War Office for the training of the troops and for their pensions. The amounts of these payments will be found in the recently published account of the Home Charges of the Indian Government. They are:—

EFFECTIVE.

Payments to War Office in respect of British forces serving in India....	£729,520

NON-EFFECTIVE.

Payments to War Office for retired pay, etc., of British forces for service in India	£431,195
	£1,160,715

In other words, India pays not only the whole both of the ordinary and of the extraordinary expenses of the British troops she employs while they are on Indian service, but in addition pays a proportion of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the cost of their training in England and a proportion of their retiring allowances.

The visit of the Shahzada to this country was expensive—to India. In the Home Charges of the Indian Government for the year ending March 31, 1896, the following item appears:—

Expenses of the visit to England of his Highness the Shahzada Nazrullah Khan £25,408

Sir John Colomb has given notice in the House of Commons of the following motion: "To call attention to the over-sea employment of Her Majesty's Indian forces, and to the particular proposal for their employment at Suakin; and to move, That, in view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of this House, and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, Debates partaking in any sense of a Party character relating to arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible Advisers of Her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire."

A highly satisfactory report as to the progress of the Poona High School for girls has reached us. The new school house is now almost completed, and it is hoped that the school may re-assemble in it after the vacation. The school has succeeded beyond the expectations of its best friends. It has surmounted many obstacles and prejudices, and won the confidence of the people. The pupils attend school more regularly, pay fees, and walk long distances. The carriage which was formerly kept for their use has been discontinued for nearly three years. At present there are seventy-two pupils in the "high school" classes. The "preparatory" class below this standard—the class which eleven years ago was the "high school" class for beginners—has been embodied in the primary school. The "high school" is now, therefore, a high school in reality, and fulfils all the Government requirements. Six pupils have matriculated, three of whom have become teachers, while two are now studying in the Grant Medical College in order to take up the medical profession. The boarding institution has been remarkably successful. There are now sixty-one girl boarders from distant parts of India, and the rooms are being enlarged to provide for a few more after the vacation.

The first of the so-called "test" matches between England and the ninth Australian team began at Lord's on June 22nd. A good deal of comment was aroused by the omission, or exclusion, of K. S. Ranjitsinhji from the English team. The Indian amateur is undoubtedly one of the best cricketers in the world, and if he has any real title to play for Sussex it seems strange that he should not have been thought eligible to play for England. But, so far as we are aware, it has not been stated on authority that Ranjitsinhji was omitted from the team because he was not born in England; and we may yet see him taking the field for "England." With regard to the birth qualification, it may be of interest to state that Lord Harris, who has appeared for England in more than one memorable match, was born in Trinidad; and that Midwinter appeared for England against Australia in 1881-2, and for Australia against England in 1878. We shall be reluctant to believe that the Committee of the Marylebone Club have left the Indian amateur out of the list because of his nationality.

INDIAN TROOPS IN THE SUDAN.

WILL INDIA HAVE TO PAY?

RUMOURED SECOND THOUGHTS.

At the time of writing it is generally expected that the Cabinet will reconsider its decision with reference to the "ordinary" expenses of the Indian troops despatched to the Sudan.

On the eve of the Whitsuntide recess Mr. Balfour stated that the resolution to authorise a charge upon the Indian revenues would be taken on Thursday, June 4th. Notice had already been given of the the resolution (which was printed in our last issue), and it stood on the Paper in the name of Lord George Hamilton.

But on June 2nd Mr. Balfour stated in the House of Commons that a telegram had been received from the Government of India "urging that the matter should not be gone on with until her Majesty's Government had received and considered a despatch embodying their views on the subject." "That," Mr. Balfour added, "is a request which we cannot refuse, and under these circumstances I am afraid I must ask the House to pass from the arrangement fixed for Thursday, and allow the matter to stand over to a later day."

Mr. Balfour's announcement that the resolution would be postponed seemed to many persons to be rather odd, as Lord George Hamilton had, a few minutes earlier, replied to questions on the subject without even hinting at any such postponement.

What made it still more odd was the fact that, in earlier discussions of the question, Lord George Hamilton had stated that the views of the Government of India would be "fully considered" before the Home Government arrived at any decision. That was on May 12th. Three days later — on May 15th—Lord G. Hamilton announced the decision of the Home Government, and gave notice of the authorising resolution.

Perhaps it was merely a coincidence that, in the meantime, the Italian Green-books, and their inconvenient contents, had become public property, and that any discussion on the Sudan question would have been embarrassing to the Government.

But, at any rate, the supporters of the Government assumed that its object was to avoid discussion at that time. Notice was given of "blocking" resolutions to prevent a motion for adjournment. Mr. Labouchere, it is true, succeeded in evading these resolutions and forcing a debate. But that only shows that he was more ingenious than the authors of the "blocking" resolutions.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

In any case, the postponement of the authorising resolution is all to the good so far as India is concerned, and we sincerely trust that it is an indication of a change of mind on the part of the Government.

The subject has continued to attract considerable attention in the British press. Want of space prevents us from giving many extracts, but we append two valuable articles which have appeared in the *Times*, together with a report of Mr. Morley's admirable speech at Leeds.

It will be noticed that at the close of the first article the writer says that if the Government changes its mind it will be "a great national triumph. For it will be the victory of the nation's sense of what is right over its power to do wrong." This is really very funny. The Government first decides to do wrong, and gives notice of a resolution to that effect. Then, when it decides to do what it ought to have done at first, it produces a "great national triumph."

MR. MORLEY SPEAKS OUT.

Mr. John Morley delivered on June 3rd, an important speech at Leeds at a conference summoned to consider the policy of the Government in the Sudan. Mr. Morley said in the course of his speech :—

I now come to the second point, which is, perhaps, the most important. I refer to the resort to Indian troops. (Hear, hear.) That marks a very grave and new departure. (Hear, hear.) You will remember that we were assured again and again that this was an Egyptian operation to be performed out of Egyptian finances. On March 19th Mr. Balfour said: "The operations are being undertaken in the interest of Egypt and the expenses will naturally be defrayed out of Egyptian funds." (Hear, hear.) It does not quite tally with the Green-book, this about the operations being undertaken in the interest of Egypt, but, at any rate, however that may be, mark this—if you are going to lend Egypt Indian troops, then the cost of those operations will not be defrayed out of Egyptian funds unless the Egyptian Government pay the ordinary and extraordinary charges of these troops. This is a passage I want to call your attention to. The Chancellor of the Exchequer on April 23rd said: "The Egyptian Government have undertaken this expedition with their own forces and at their own cost." But if you are going to lend them Indian troops—I see that something like 2,500 Indian troops have already landed at Suakin—if you are going to lend them Indian troops, who will release a corresponding force of Egyptian troops at Suakin for operations elsewhere, you can no longer say that the Egyptian Government have undertaken this business with their own forces. (Hear, hear.) Again and again we were told that we should measure the magnitude of our military operations in the Sudan by the military and financial resources of Egypt, and on April 14th the Secretary of State for India said he saw no reason at all to suppose that the Egyptian Army was not adequate to the task. But you now see for yourselves that that calculation is falsified and that the Egyptian army is not adequate to the task, or they would not have resorted to troops from India. Now, there is more than one point of the highest constitutional importance involved in this resort to Indian troops. The objects, mark you, of this expedition are unlimited. I defy any man who has followed these debates ever so closely, these declarations of the Government, attenuated as they are, to say what is the limit of the object of these operations. Then what are you going to do? They are not specific operations, not for a limited time, not for a definite purpose. If you assent without protest to this resort to Indian troops you are going to admit that there is an unlimited reservoir of Indian forces which may be employed for these unlimited and indefinite objects. (Cheers.) I do not believe any serious man who thinks about such a position as that will feel that it is a safe or a prudent position. Of course, we all know that if the Empire were in danger, if it were a case of self-preservation, we should resort to Indian troops under proper conditions, but this is not a question of self-preservation. This is not a question that India is particularly interested in. Indeed, I can imagine there might be those who might say that the interests of India as a producer, producing corn, cotton, and other commodities which Egypt also produces —that the material interests of India and Egypt are by no means identical, but that is a point I will not dwell upon this afternoon.

INDIA AND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

I am dwelling upon the point that you ought not on any account to make it a matter of course that for any purpose Indian troops are to be resorted to, and above all we shall be prepared to show, when the proper day comes, that to resort to these troops without the assent of Parliament is an invasion of an Act of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) They may refine about that as they please, but you will never persuade me that there is any place where a more rigorous and exact construction ought to be insisted upon in an Act of Parliament, where such a construction ought to be more jealously insisted upon, than in the High Court of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I see that last night a member of Parliament put upon the paper this notice of a motion—I wish to show you how things are going. The gentleman is not exactly an oracle of wisdom, I admit, but, still, this is his motion—"In view of the want of practical knowledge and administrative experience of India which characterises generally the members of the House (laughter), and having regard to the magnitude and complexity of Indian affairs, debates partaking in any sense of a party character relating to any arrangements agreed upon by the Government of India and the responsible advisers of her Majesty are not advantageous to the welfare of the British Empire." (Laughter.) Gentlemen, do you realise that? Of course, that is a very silly motion, but then I have observed, and I dare say that you have before now, that silliness very often only puts into capital letters ideas that are lurking at the back of the minds of people who pass for being decently sensible. We shall be prepared to debate that motion, that the House of Commons is so ignorant of Indian affairs that we must allow Her Majesty's Government in Downing Street and the Government at Calcutta to do whatever they like. We shall see whether that view prevails or not. If we are anything we are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented natives of India. (Cheers.) It is even more important that we should recognise our representative duty to them than it is to you, because you can call us if we displease you—you do (laughter) —quickly to account, you can make yourselves heard, you can press your views and opinions upon us; but the natives of India cannot, and I want to ask your consideration of a matter to which we shall invite the attention of the House of Commons when the time comes, and that is the payment of these troops. (Hear, hear.) The proposal as I understand it—though it is not yet definitely settled—it would appear that the proposal is that the extraordinary charges of this Indian force shall be paid either by Great Britain or by Egypt. That is not settled, but anyhow India is to pay the ordinary charges of the troops that she lends to Egypt. It is said—and I want you to be so kind as to follow this argument, if you will, in anticipation, because you will hear, I have no doubt, plenty of discussion on it by-and-bye—it is said, "Why should not India pay the ordinary charges of these troops going to the Sudan? She would have to keep them anyhow." That is not the way it presents itself to the population of India. What they say is this, what they ask is this—at whose cost have these Indian forces been drilled, trained, armed and equipped for your service? At the cost of the Indian taxpayer. Second, from whom are they to draw day by day their regular pay while engaged in these operations of yours? From funds provided by India. You cannot wonder that, that being the case, the answer to those questions being those two answers, the Indian population and the Indian Government say, "If you are going to take our troops, you or Egypt ought to bear the whole burden."

LORD SALISBURY'S OPINION IN 1867.

I have got an admirable authority for that view, and an admirable authority not only for that view as to the comparatively secondary matter regarding the source from which the payment of this force is to come, but as to the whole policy. In the year 1867 an Indian contingent was brought to help in operations in Abyssinia. There was a debate in the House of Commons, and the late Mr. Fawcett—then a comparatively new member—said, "I object altogether to any por-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

tion of the expense of this contingent falling upon India," and he divided the House upon that and went into the lobby with men like Mr. Bright and Mr. Forster. (Hear, hear.) But a statesman who is still living, who now occupies the very highest position of Government authority in this country—he was Lord Cranborne then, he is now Lord Salisbury—Lord Cranborne made a speech, and what did he say? I do not quote it, believe me, for any purpose of party recrimination, because for anything I know he holds those opinions to this hour—(a laugh)—and will perhaps act upon them. I have no doubt he will act upon them if he still holds the opinions, that is, if he has not changed his opinions, which he has a right to do as others have done. But this I know, that a more excellent expression of a sounder or a profounder view I do not know than this sentence, which I will take the liberty of reading. Lord Cranborne—he was supporting Mr. Fawcett—said, "I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed." (Hear, hear.) I repeat, that is a profound and wise view, admirably expressed, as Lord Salisbury has the gift of doing; it is a view which I have to impress upon you this afternoon with reference to the general aspect of the Sudan case. It is not good for us to barrack on Oriental seas military forces without paying for them. It is bad for us. It either indicates that we have more troops in India than it is necessary to keep there, or some other case.

A WARNING.

I am not going to detain you any longer, but I hope I have succeeded in showing you that there are many grounds on which we are justified in protesting against these events. (Cheers.) You hear a great deal now about something that is called "Imperial instinct." (Laughter.) I am proud of our great Empire, of all the noble and beneficent work that it has done all over the face of the globe, as any jingo among them. (Hear, hear.) But there is a sham and a counterfeit and a bastard kind of Imperial instinct—(cheers)—of which in these days we are hearing a good deal too much, and which, if you do not keep your eyes open, will land the country in mischief. (Hear, hear.) People sink the difference between right and wrong; they ride roughshod over facts and over reasonable probabilities; they brush aside considerations of prudence and policy such as those I have been endeavouring to bring before you this afternoon, and they call that Imperial instinct. (Hear, hear.) Now, let us come to the practical point. So far nothing worse has been done than the perpetration of a clumsy blunder in reference to the Sudan, but, if persisted in, what is now only a clumsy blunder will wax and grow, as it has done before in connexion with this same land, till it becomes a very grave peril and a hateful crime. (Hear, hear.) I hope you agree with me that a modern war is the most hateful of all. (Cheers.) You have had Sudan affairs to consider before. You found before that you were beaten, not by men but by nature, and if you allow yourselves to drift into this enterprise, which will become, from a blundering enterprise, a criminal enterprise, you will find yourselves beaten again. Now is the time for reflection. It has not yet become a party matter. You must now resist mischief. You, gentlemen, are persons of influence and consideration in your various localities. You are, I am sure, or you would not be here at considerable personal inconvenience, men in whom party spirit is secondary, as it ought to be, to conviction. (Hear, hear.) If I have done anything to strengthen the conviction, I do hope that you will use every means within your power to put pressure upon everybody over whom you have influence, including even members of Parliament—(laughter)—to insist either that we shall have a clear, definite, and intelligible statement of the reasons why Egypt is now pushed into the Sudan, and why Indian troops are being brought into the Sudan, or, if no such reason can be given, that the Government shall desist from the enterprise on which they have so rashly and indefensibly embarked. (Loud cheers.)

Responding to a vote of thanks, Mr. Morley said:

I have to thank you very sincerely for the cordial reception of this vote of thanks and for the great patience with which you were good enough to listen to my story of this expedition. I confess that when I was first invited to come here I felt that I would prefer coming to a gathering of these dimensions rather than one of those gigantic public gatherings I have had the honour of addressing in Leeds before now. This case is at present in the condition which requires cool, patient, close, and steady regard to the facts. I hope that at all public meetings, great or small, one does one's best to give cool, close, and steady attention to the facts, but when you have many extracts to read and dates to give, and so forth, no doubt there are advantages in a gathering of this kind. I hope that each one of you will become persuaded of the rights of that of which I have been speaking and will each become a centre for spreading the conviction amongst your neighbours. (Cheers.)

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The writer of the article entitled "Indian Affairs" said, in the *Times* of June 8th:—

Mr. Balfour respected the best sense of the nation in deferring the debate on the Suakin contingent until the Government of India's despatch reaches this country. The decision now to be arrived at as to the fair payment for the Indian troops will have far-reaching consequences. For it is evident that the extension of the British power in tropical Africa must lead to demands, both industrial and military, upon the Indian races with a frequency heretofore unknown. Meanwhile from India itself come signs of a gathering storm such as has not arisen for many years. Whatever the tenour of the official communication now on its way from the Viceroy, there can be no question as to the view which our countrymen in India and the Indians themselves take of the situation. The papers urge the injustice of charging the regular pay of the Suakin contingent to the Indian taxpayer with a unanimity and a force of conviction to which no British statesman should turn a deaf ear. It is hard to imagine more different treatments of the question than those adopted by the leading Bombay papers brought by last mail. The *Times of India* appeals to the statutes which form the constitutional law as between Britain and her great dependency. The *Bombay Gazette* deals strictly with the individual instance. The result in each case is a powerful protest against a course of action which these papers, in common with the whole native and European Press of India, condemn as impolitic, dangerous, and unjust.

The constitutional opponents take their stand on the Act for the Better Government of India which governs the situation. "Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not without the consent of both Houses of Parliament be applicable to defray any military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." It cannot be pretended that there is, in the present instance, "any actual invasion of her Majesty's Indian possessions." Nor can it be seriously maintained that there is a "sudden and urgent necessity" such as

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

would justify the Government in excepting it from the express provision of the Act. The financial critics come at once to closer quarters with the individual wrong-doing, and in words almost identical with those used some time ago in these columns. The British regiments employed in India are paid, equipped, and kept up as contiuous fighting units by the Indian taxpayer. The Indian troops intended by the British Government for Egyptian service are to be paid, equipped, and kept up as continous fighting units by the Indian taxpayer. They are taken by a *fiat* from Downing Street, says the *Bombay Gazette*, "for some purpose which may be Italian or Egyptian, or international, but is in no sense Indian. They go to the Sudan either (1) to enable Italy to hold Kassala against the Dervishes and to make head against the Abyssinians; or (2) to help Egypt to recover Dongola and co-operate in the reconquest of the Sudan; so that (3), when the time comes, Great Britain will be in a position to restore Egypt to the Egyptians not as it now is, but as it was when we first intervened in its domestic politics. Thus the Indian taxpayer is to be called upon to finance a military expedition which may subserve Italian or Egyptian interests, and respond to the new sentimentalism that seeks to re-establish the *status quo ante* in the Sudan as the indispensable preliminary to the evacuation of Egypt." In regard to the necessity for the expedition, or the wisdom of the policy which led to it, the Indian Press refrains from passing judgment. But it unanimonsly insists that the objects of the expedition, whether Italian or Egyptian, are certainly not Indian, and it protests against the heavily burdened Indian taxpayer being forced to find the daily pay for troops employed on another nation's service.

The Indian Press acknowledges the patriotic interest which India, in common with the other colonies and dependencies of Great Britain, has in the stability of our position in Egypt. But it points out that, while Great Britain has a still larger interest in the stability of our position in India, she contributes not a penny to the military maintenance of our position in India. The loss of the Sudan is nothing to India compared with what the loss of India would be to Great Britain, yet India is to be charged with the daily pay of the Indian regiments sent to recover the Sudan, while Great Britain charges to India the uttermost farthing for the British troops sent to India. The request of India is that the joint interest of the colonies and dependencies in our position in Egypt shall be fairly appraised and apportioned, and not be thurst upon India alone. Ceylon, Hong-kong, the great Australian colonies, and the other dependencies and settlements of Great Britain in the East have with India a common interest in the protection of the Suez Canal. On India falls the costly permanent burden of securing for Great Britain the Asiatic approach to the Canal at Aden. That might be fairly taken as a discharge in full of India's liability arising out of her joint interest, and any extra troops required for Egypt might be charged to the other colonies and dependencies, or defrayed by Great Britain if she feared to do so. Yet, as the Indian newspapers point out, the other colonies and dependencies "have not been asked to send a single regiment to the Sudan."

We have tried to eliminate any violent expressions of feeling. Such violent expressions tend to obscure the real issue. But it would be wrong to conceal the fact that the question "has evoked the strongest indignation amongst Europeans and natives alike." It must be remembered, however, that Lord George Hamilton merely follows a precedent which it would be difficult for any Ministry to disregard, unless supported by a strong expression of public opinion. Each occasion on which Indian troops have been borrowed by Great Britain seemed at the moment entirely exceptional, and in most cases India was made to defray their daily pay. In certain cases Great Britain refunded the cost in whole or part; as by a grant of five millions sterling to India for the 1878 expedition (Afghanistan), of £500,000 for that of 1882 (Egypt), or by payment of the whole cost as in the China expedition of 1859-60, and for the Indian troops sent to Malta in 1878. The intensity of feeling and the grave apprehension with which the action of the British Government is now being watched in India arise from the conviction that the present occasion cannot be regarded as accidental, and that it must form the precedent for regulating subsequent cases. If the Government should insist on establishing that precedent, it will harden an occasional injustice into a permanent wrong. The issue has been placed before Parliament in the clearest terms by Lord George Hamilton's proposed resolution and by the amendments of Mr. John Morley and others thereto.

It is not in reality a question for the Government, but for the nation. The British nation has the power to saddle the Indian taxpayer with this inequitable charge. Has the British nation the public virtue to abstain from doing so? It is always possible to find precedents for the ignobler course. In the present case it is particularly easy to do so. It is equally easy to obscure the real question by diverging into side issues, as was done by a correspondent in our columns last week. The question was not whether India should lend troops for Egyptian service "precisely on the same terms, pecuniary and otherwise," as she allows post-office clerks or railway labourers to go to tropical Africa. It was whether the British Government could justly take troops from India without paying their daily wages, while in every other branch of administrative or industrial employment payment has to be made. Nor will the plea avail that the troops are not needed in India, and may therefore be employed at India's cost in Africa. That plea would do us more harm in India than if we were forcibly to take the money and say nothing. For the standing complaint in India is that the Indian military expenditure is inflated and kept up at an undue height to suit the exigencies of British policy rather than to meet the needs of India herself. The list of occasions on which troops have thus been taken from India is already a long one, and suffices to give some colour to this complaint. If it were now to authoritatively go forth that the Indian Army is maintained at a standard which permanently suffices for British emergencies as well as for Indian defence, it would

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

falsify the statements made by successive Viceroys and successive Commanders-in-Chief in India during the past twenty-five years.

Unless Lord Salisbury's words in 1867 have been misrepresented, it is little likely that any such plea will be offered. England had then to deal with a real emergency, and the employment of Indian troops in Abyssinia seemed so absolutely exceptional as to minimise the risk of the terms being used as a precedent. Yet Lord Salisbury took the occasion to lay down from the first the principles which should regulate such transactions. When, as Lord Cranborne, he supported Mr. Fawcett against the charging the pay of the troops to India he said:—

"I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them. If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed."

It is sincerely to be hoped, since the question has ceased to be an accidental one, and the decision of Parliament at the present must become the precedent for the future, that the principles which Lord Cranborne laid down in 1867 will weigh with Lord Salisbury in 1896. Many things have changed since then. But the temptation to shift burdens unfairly to the shoulders of the Indian taxpayer has not changed, and the difficulty of securing justice for India is almost as great as ever. It will form one of the historical triumphs of the Conservative party if, after having given to India the Queen's proclamation, which is the charter of the Indian races, and the recent Councils Law, which serves as the basis of Indian legislation by representation, they now join with all other parties in securing this great act of financial justice to India. But it will be a still greater national triumph. For it will be the victory of the nation's sense of what is right over its power to do wrong.

In a leading article on June 8th, the *Times* wrote: The question whether the expense of the contingent sent to Suakin is or is not to fall upon the Indian taxpayers will have to be considered as soon as the despatches from the Calcutta Government have been received. It must not be forgotten that India makes no contribution to the cost of the British Navy, which, nevertheless, constitutes the main defence of our Eastern possessions against foreign aggression. It cannot be contended, therefore, that the policy of this country tends, on the whole, to deal hardly with India in regard to such questions. Nevertheless, we adhere to our opinion that, whatever may be the technical rights as between the Imperial and the Indian Exchequers, it would be most inexpedient to create a precedent for throwing upon the taxpayers of India the whole or the greater part of the cost of protecting external interests in which England and other portions of the Empire are at least as directly implicated. Many years ago, when the present Prime Minster was in the House of Commons, he protested, during the Abyssian expedition, against treating India "as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them."

OPINION IN INDIA.

The following excellent summary of opinion in India appeared in the *Times* for June 16th, under the heading "Indian Affairs":

We can render no better service to the nation than by summarising the protests brought by last week's mail against charging India with the daily pay of the Suakin contingent. The Bombay Presidency Association had already telegraphed to the Secretary of State "humbly, but firmly, praying that no portion of the cost of the Indian troops be defrayed from Indian revenues. Otherwise, a universal feeling of deep injustice and discontent will result." The telegram, together with a memorial to the Viceroy, was signed by a member of Council of the highest standing in Western India. It very moderately describes the state of feeling which has now actually resulted. That feeling is intensified by the fact that the Indian Government has something very like a famine on its hands, or, rather, a widespread scarcity which, but for State relief on a large scale, would develop into famine. India has, by an enormous addition to her public burdens, just succeeded in staggering back to solvency. She finds it hard that the sacrifices which she has made should be taken advantage of to lay new and unjust burdens upon her. It is impossible to read the articles in the European and native Press without a conviction that by this act we shall be creating a widespread feeling of disloyalty which may undo at a stroke the work of years.

The loyalty of British India, it should never be forgotten, has been the slow product of the just administration of British India. We see in the persistent rebellion of Portuguese India the state of things produced by bad administration. Even in the depth of its present troubles, when one Viceroy has been superseded after another, and the King of Portugal's brother himself has acknowledged his military expedition to Goa a failure and had to abandon the attempt to put down the insurrection, miserable charges of peculation emerge. A committee at Goa is now inquiring whether one high officer went off with Rs.95,000 and another with Rs. 35,000. Such charges against the administrators of British India are unknown. The mere suspicion of personal malversation by a high Anglo-Indian official would send a thrill of indignation throughout both England and India. But India is now complaining of what she regards as an act of financial malversation on a far larger scale, against which she has no appeal except to the justice of the British nation.

A significant feature of the case is that the most strongly British organs in India feel themselves constrained to protest most emphatically against the proposed charge. "There is no precedent," says the *Calcutta Englishman*, "for Indian troops being employed to assist Egypt in recovering a province which was first of all driven into revolt by Egyptian

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

tyranny, and then abandoned to the Dervishes through Egyptian ineptitude. Precedent is to be dragged in by the heels to justify another imposition on India." "We know beforehand," writes the *Pioneer*, which represents the more official classes of our countrymen in India, "what arguments will be used to justify this policy. But, whatever force they may have as regards Egypt proper, they have hardly any reference to an advance into the Sudan. . . . . We have heard nothing before of Indian interests being involved, and at a time when this country is struggling with financial difficulties, while England has just realised one of the biggest surpluses on record, and Egypt has large reserves, it is surely too bad to borrow troops we can ill spare and then to make us pay for our assistance."

These are the best things that our friends can say for us. The *Hindu Patriot*, which holds a position to the wealthy and patriotic natives of Bengal similar to that which the *Englishman* does to the British independent community and the *Pioneer* to the administrative and general body, speaks in terms of deep sorrow. This act of injustice, if persisted in, will grave itself into the memory of the people. The *Indian Mirror*, the organ of the progressive classes in Bengal, declares that it could scarcely have credited that the British Government contemplated such a course, "but for a definite statement made from the Ministerial bench. India has no part or lot in Egypt's quarrel with the Mahdi. The reconquest of the Sudan, if such a consummation is brought about, will bring gain to Egypt and glory possibly to England, but it will not bring a cent. to the Indian treasury." In a powerful leader on "The Iniquity of Making India Pay," the *Mirror* freely acknowledges that previous charges of the kind may be cited. But it points out that such wrongs done to India in the past were of an exceptional character, and it protests against their being converted into a permanent precedent. "Because Indian troops once or twice fought out of India, and their cost was wrested from the Indian Government, is that a reason why an act of similar injustice should be perpetrated again?" This is the popular and native way of putting what the British organs in India express with more exactitude and reserve. But it matters not to which province or to which class of journals we turn. The whole of the newspapers throughout India are saying the same thing each in its own way.

Organs of social and religious reform prefer to dwell on the immorality of the proceeding. "Does not the manner," asks the *Indian Spectator*, "in which the Ministers have been replying to the questions put to them show that they are doing things which their own conscience tells them they should not do?" A strong young political paper like the *Bombay Champion* takes its stand upon the purely political ground. "Why should India be a military reserve?" "Our Viceroys and Commanders-in-Chief," it says, "are always proclaiming that even the increased army strength of the country is not adequate. Either the Indian army is in excess of our present requirements or not. If it is, then the sooner the strength is reduced, and the taxpayer relieved of some portion of his present intolerable burdens, the better." The truth is that this attempt to charge India with the Suakin contingent has given a new force to the agitation against the ever-increasing military expenditure in India. It has reduced to the baldest terms the question, "Why should India be a military reserve?" "If troops can be spared from the Indian garrison," writes the *Calcutta Statesman*, "to fight battles thousands of miles away, in which India has no concern, not merely in the case of some exceptional emergency, but in order to enable England to wage wars the cost of which would be prohibitive if the operations were carried out entirely by British troops, the natural conclusion suggested is that the Indian garrison is larger than the circumstances of the country require, and that the people of India are being saddled with the cost of the excess for the benefit, or what her Majesty's Ministers conceive to be the benefit, of the British taxpayer."

We have been careful to quote only from journals which approach the question with a sense of responsibility as to the words which they employ. But a striking feature of the Indian Press, both British and native, is that on really great occasions it displays a grave solidarity of moderation unknown during a crisis in France or Germany, or in any country of Continental Europe. The Indian newspapers which most strenuously protest against the proposed charges are the most careful to acknowledge the Imperial liabilities of India. They admit that emergencies may arise in which India might fairly be called upon to lend troops. They also admit the existence of "broad Imperial considerations" which would, in a time of danger to the Empire, call forth the loyal and spontaneous help of India. "Within proper limits," says the *Calcutta Statesman*, "we are prepared to accept the principle" of joint responsibility. "And so, too, are we," comments the *Bombay Champion*. "But only on the condition that it is reciprocal, and that a line is drawn at what may be truly and jointly considered as Imperial interests." The present system of appealing to Imperial considerations whenever we want to make India pay, and of ignoring Imperial considerations whenever we wish in our own financial arrangements with India to save the pocket of the British taxpayer, is declared to be "a travesty of justice."

These are but a few of the embarrassing questions which the proposal to saddle India with the cost of the Suakin contingent has raised in India. They are extremely embarrassing questions. For they run counter to the most solemn declarations made by our Indian Government, and cast doubts upon the sincerity of every Viceroy and Finance Minister and Commander-in-Chief in India during the past twenty years. "The sole material interest which India possesses in Egypt," the Government of India declared on a memorable occasion, "is that the transit of ships through the Suez Canal should be assured. . . . . We do not understand on what principle of political equity India can be called upon to defray part of the cost of armed intervention in Egypt, unless the Australian and other colonies are called upon to pay their proportionate share." It must be remembered that India regards her external expenditure on behalf of Imperial interests as more than equivalent to what might be claimed as her contri-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

bution to naval defence in Asiatic waters. That expenditure includes not only coast charges for the Red Sea and Persian Gulf and compulsory payments for establishments in connexion with Persia, China, and other countries far beyond her frontier. It also includes annual military contributions exceeding a million sterling, and now under the consideration of the Royal Commission, for the recruitment and pensions of the British Army at home. Such matters of permanent financial adjustment between Great Britain and India lie apart from the question now at issue.

THE TRANSVAAL AND INDIA.

[FROM THE "MADRAS REVIEW."]

If it were possible for us in India to arrive at some agreement with Englishmen on the great questions in debate concerning the Government of the country, or rather on the principles that ought to guide them, we might regard the future with equanimity and with hope. But we are confronted with the same difficulty in India which has been felt in almost every country in the world. Everybody will acknowledge that the sovereign has certain duties. The most despotic of rulers will readily concede that he is bound by what may be loosely called laws towards his subjects. The duties of kings are laid down in the old Hindu Sastras with a comprehensiveness which leave very little to be desired. The oligarchies of ancient Rome and of Venice acknowledged their responsibility for good government and their duties to the masses with the same readiness with which the ruling classes of England express their willingness to ameliorate the conditions of the poorer classes in England. Except perhaps in England, however, it has been left to the superior and governing classes to define their own duties as well as the obligations of the lower classes.

But to the lower classes the position taken by the apologists of the superior classes has always appeared unsatisfactory and generally the problem has been solved by civil war. There are, however, signs that by constitutional agitation, reforms, that in the olden days were attainable only by revolutions, could now be achieved by more peaceful means. India itself is a striking example, and the reforms that have been introduced acquire a remarkable significance as an indication of what is possible by persistent and constitutional agitation. In carrying on this agitation, nothing is more instructive as a lesson to ourselves and to our rulers than their conduct in those days when labouring under disabilities, but unfortunately the memories of those days are easily forgotten. A Puritan clamouring for liberty and toleration has been known, when in power, to be more tolerant towards other sects than his own oppressors. It is far more useful therefore to recall to the mind of our rulers how their own race, living under laws far more favourable than our own in India, are contemporaneously with ourselves claiming privileges, far higher than ever claimed by us. Transvaal is a Boer Republic, where the majority of the Europeans, the Uitlanders, have no franchise or share in the government of the country. Their grievances have been held to justify strong remonstrances from such men as Messrs. Balfour and Chamberlain. They have evoked great sympathy in England and have been regarded potent enough to palliate the armed raid of Dr. Jameson into Transvaal. Nowhere else in the world are Englishmen—for the great majority of Uitlanders are Englishmen—forced to beg concessions from a superior race. They have always formed the governing body and it has been their pride to point out to races subject to them the conditions under which alone the franchise could be granted and they could be allowed to take part in the government of the country. Transvaal is, we believe, the one place in the world where the governing body is of a different race, and the majority of the ruled are Englishmen who have no voice in the Government. It is instructive, therefore, to note under what conditions they consider that the franchise ought to be bestowed on them and compare such conditions with those that exist in other countries where the Englishmen themselves form the dominant race and other races have to crave of them the indulgence, which they now pray may be conceded to them in Transvaal.

The Uitlanders say that they are the vast majority in the State, owning more than half the land and taken in the aggregate, nine-tenths of the property; and yet in all matters affecting their properties, lives, or liberties they have no voice as they are denied the right to vote for election to the First Volksraad. They protest against any taxation without representation. And they maintain that taxes which in their view are most inequitable are imposed. They condemn a legislature which is elected only by a minority, one-third of the people. And they assume, as not requiring any argument to prove the same, that when such minority is composed of a different race, speaking a different language, with different pursuits and traditions from the majority, government by such minority stands self-condemned.

Turning to the executive government they complain that the power of the executive is absolute, with no responsibility to the people: that all legislation is initiated by the executive.

With reference to the courts which in the absence of representation in the Councils is the sole guardian of their rights, it is alleged that attempts are being constantly made to reduce them to a position subordinate to the Executive. The Uitlanders plead they have not got the right of being tried by a jury of their own countrymen, and that there is no chance of receiving even-handed justice in a trial before a jury of burghers. As to railways, it is a grievance that it is entirely in the hands of a corporation domiciled in Holland. The governing race is alleged to show a determination to retain all power in their own hands and to spend money on fortifications intended to terrorise the Uitlanders.

We believe we have fairly stated their grievances. Let us compare their position with ours. If in Transvaal they form a majority, being apparently double in numbers to the governing races, in India they form only an infinitesimal portion of the population. If in Transvaal they own nine-tenths of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

property, in India the majority of the Indians own almost the entire property. The difference between an Uitlander and a Boer is certainly not so wide as between an Englishman and an Indian. One would think, therefore, that the claims of the Indians for representation in the government of the Indian Empire are irresistible, but yet what do we find now?

In Transvaal they have at least an independent legislative council able to make its own laws and enforce them. In India we have really no such legislative council. In the Volksraad there are some members who are able and willing to help the Uitlanders, and if these Uitlanders succeed in persuading the free and independent members generally of the justice of their claim there is nothing to prevent the Volksraad from doing them justice. But in India there is no council, free and independent, to be persuaded. So that while the Uitlanders complain of non-representation in the Free Council of the Republic, we have to complain that there is no Free Council at all for the framing of the laws, and to superintend the administration of such laws.

The councils that exist in India are a mere mockery intended to shield the executive and to invest with an appearance of deliberation and fairness all their high-handed acts of tyranny. They can only register the verdicts of the executive, and the non-officials are appointed to congratulate the officials on the consummate ability, wisdom and tact which, in the opinion of the latter, they always display. There is of course no representation, as the members that sit in the legislative councils are not members really elected by independent voters, nor are these sham councils in any way useful for effective impartial legislation or control. The Budget is not submitted to them for their approval. And they have no control over the spending departments, which, so far as the councils are concerned, are free to do what they like. As the executive in India has such entire control over the legislative councils it is needless to state that the laws passed by such councils can scarcely be relied on to safe-guard the natural liberties of the people against the executive. Where the laws are not impartial the Judges can do little. Yet in India we know that attempts are persistently being made to bring the High Courts into subordination to the executive. As to the masses they are ground down in India by judicial tyranny. The tax-gathering collector, and not the administrator of justice, is the representative of the Queen. The magistrates depend for their promotion on the Revenue officials. And the entire administration of justice is subordinated to the prompt collection of an oppressive Revenue and to the maintenance of the prestige of the superior race. The Police are notoriously inefficient. From the highest to the lowest oppression descends through all the classes of society. Yet an Englishman in India if asked to apply a remedy by admitting the Indians to a share in the Government will regard such demand as absurd and beyond the pale of practical politics. The great moral force of England behind the Uitlanders, the great physical force of England to support the Anglo-Indians makes all the difference.

In Transvaal they plead that they have not the right to be tried by a jury of their own countrymen and that a jury of burghers will never mete out justice to them. In India it has been long recognised that trial by an English jury where the accused is an Englishman is a farce. The result is that the English soldier may commit any brutality with practical impunity. Well might an uncharitable Turk say in reply to Canon MacColl that it is not in Turkey alone that the members of the ruling race are free to commit certain offences with impunity, and that there is one law for the ruling race and another for the ruled.

As in Transvaal, the railways in India are generally in the hands of companies in England and are worked, not with a view to India's benefit and profits but as an investment for the Englishman and for the Englishman's profits. Above all, the money raised in India is not spent in India; crores and crores of rupees are for one reason or another poured into England, and the life blood of India is being slowly but surely drained on account of a want of any effective check by Indians over the expenditure. Far greater reason exists in India than in Transvaal why the great majority of the people of the country ought to be allowed a voice in the councils of the nation.

We have assumed throughout that the Transvaal Uitlanders' complaint is true that they have no effective voice in legislation. Let us examine this statement a little closely.

The Parliament of Transvaal consist of two chambers:—the first Volksraad, and the second Volksraad. The members of the first Volksraad, the President of the Republic, and the Commandant General are to be chosen by those who had the franchise previous to the year 1890 and their children, who can claim the franchise upon the attainment of the age of sixteen. Before 1890 those alone had the franchise who were burghers, and to be a burgher one must have been born within the Republic and attained the age of eighteen. Persons not born within the Republic could till then, but not subsequently, obtain burgher rights by a residence of five years and taking the oath of allegiance.

This franchise could also be acquired by those who, during a period of ten years, were qualified to be chosen as members of the second Volksraad, and after a resolution to that effect has been passed by the first Volksraad.

For the second Volksraad, besides those entitled to vote for the first Volksraad, a white male person coming from elsewhere could obtain the right to vote after a residence of two years if he conforms to the laws and takes the oath of allegiance to the Republic, renouncing the allegiance to the sovereign to whom till then he was subject.

The second chamber can legislate on the following:

(1) The mines, postal, telegraphic, and telephonic departments.
(2) The making and maintenance of waggon and postal roads.
(3) The protection of inventions, patterns, trade marks, and author's rights.
(4) The working and maintenance of forests and salt pans
(5) Company and insolvency laws.
(6) Civil and criminal procedure.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

(7) Such other matters as the first chamber may entrust it with.

All the laws passed by the first chamber have the force of law and cannot be vetoed by the second except those that trench upon the above subjects.

The complaint is that no child born in Transvaal has, of right, the franchise unless his father was a burgher, or became naturalised under the rules above referred to, that no advantage of any value is derived by being able to vote for election to the second chamber, and that the chances of obtaining the right to vote for election to the first chamber are very remote.

Johannesburg is a mining town, and the second Volksraad have the right of legislation with reference to mines. It almost takes our breath away to see that the concession to legislate on the matters above referred to are considered of no advantage. If the people of India had power to legislate on the criminal procedure laws, the hateful distinction between the laws applicable to Europeans and those to natives would be swept away in a moment. If the Indians had a voice in the legislation concerning Forests and salt, is it to be supposed for a moment that the statute book would have been disfigured by the existing laws? In fact, President Kruger has only to inform the English Uitlanders that he proposes to follow the beneficent Government of England in India. Then nothing more will be heard of the Uitlander claim.

Mr. Balfour said something of the character of the Uitlanders which rendered it desirable that the franchise claimed should be conferred on them. The Boers were under the English dominion. Hating England's rule they emigrated northwards and settled in Transvaal, whither they were followed by the English Government. A revolt and the recognition of their independence was the result. They attempted to live peaceably with their English neighbours, and the naturalisation laws of 1884 passed by them were mild. In 1890 the second Volksraad was created to bring the original burghers and Uitlanders together as a step towards the fusion of the two Volksraads, even after the chief of the Republic was deliberately insulted when he visited Johannesburg by hauling down the Republican flag. But the English attitude continued hostile. There were strong indications to show that if the franchise were bestowed on the Uitlanders, it would be used by the majority of them, who were Englishmen, against the Republic, and that the Republic would be merged in the surrounding English countries. The Uitlanders will not take the oath of allegiance to the Republic. They will not take up arms against the foes of the Republic. They have been guilty of inviting armed intervention. Is it a wonder, then, that they are denied the right of franchise?

But what about India's past and present? Whatever an Englishman who knows not of India's past might say, it was India's sons, under the guidance of English statesmen and generals, that created the Indian Empire—as to her loyalty, it would be an insult to discuss that question. Thus we find all along that the attitude of Englishmen as regarded the mutual relations that ought to subsist between the rulers and the ruled, affords a strange contrast in the two continents of Asia and Africa. What little they grudge so much to give away as rulers in India, they indignantly demand as the ruled in the other. In Transvaal they ask for concessions which, even in spite of strong grounds, they superciliously deny to us in India; and, strange to say, they have the sympathetic conscience of influential England to back them up in their demands, which we practically have not. Curiously enough, they maintain that one set of political principles should guide them as a ruling race, and a diametrically opposite set should govern them when under a foreign domination.

Finally, we have only to ask Englishmen to bear in mind when considering India's claims, that the President of the Union, Mr. Charles Leonard, on behalf of the Uitlanders, claimed, with the approval and sympathy of the English race, "representation" as one of the elementary rights of citizenship.

Reviews.

INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW.

The Criminal Law of India. By JOHN D. MAYNE. (Madras: Higginbotham and Co. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co. Bombay: Thacker and Co. London: W. Clowes and Sons, Limited.)

Mr. Mayne's name is a well-known guarantee for able, painstaking, and solid work. This is a thick volume of a thousand close-packed pages, most carefully compiled, independently and vigorously thought out, and expressed with masterly lucidity. It supersedes Mr. Mayne's Commentary on the Penal Code. The First Part consists of a print of the text of the Indian Penal Code, with running commentary, clause by clause, and references to the Second Part. It occupies 228 pages. The Second Part offers a methodised view of the Criminal Law at present administered in India, so far as it is based on the Penal Code, the Criminal Procedure Code, and the Evidence Act. In his exposition Mr. Mayne makes an unusually extensive use of the decisions of the Civil Courts—a procedure justifiable on the merits, and likely to be especially welcomed by advocates and judges out of reach of the law libraries of the Presidency towns. He has also made very large reference to English authorities in his explanations of the Code, undeterred by the reprobation of the practice by the Judicial Committee. We are on Mr. Mayne's side. You cannot turn the leaves of any volume of Indian reports without seeing that he is following the example of the Indian Courts; and he justly feels bound to "supply the local Bar and Bench with the authorities by which their proceedings will undoubtedly be tested on appeal." Besides, in the application of the clear-cut rules of the Code to the multifarious facts of the various cases, "the recorded experience of centuries of English experts must be of the highest importance." The volume is undoubtedly a great contribution to the exposition and elucidation of a most important branch of law; and it will be found useful for reference in England as well as in India, notably on the discussion of principles.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

MEN OF THE SOUTH.

Representative Men of Southern India. (Madras: Price Current Press. 1896.)

"Let us praise famous men and the fathers that begat us." It was a happy thought of Mr. G. Paramaswaran Pillai, the enterprising Editor of the *Madras Standard*, to publish in his paper a series of sketches of the distinguished men of Southern India. Now he has selected for separate publication the lives of a dozen of these representative men, with portraits which, though on a small scale, nevertheless show the interesting faces of the group. We should have been better pleased if Mr. Pillai had given us two or three dozen sketches, instead of one; indeed, we should have welcomed his "Portrait Gallery" entire. The fame of many of the men may as yet be only local, but one likes to keep in view the rising as well as the completed careers of men that do good service in their day and generation. The selection now before us represents a remarkable variety of public work:

"Among the Princes and Zemindars of Southern India none are better known than Sir Rama Varma, the late Maharája of Travancore, and Sir Vizia Rama, the late Maharája of Vizianagram. Sir Madava Row, V. Ramiengar, C. V. Runga Charlu, and A. Sheshia Sastri are acknowledged on all hands to be the most distinguished of South Indian statesmen. As a linguist, C. V. Runganada Sastri has left behind him a reputation which is unique. As a jurist, none has surpassed Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar. In the field of education, nobody has yet been found to take the place of Rai Bahadur Gopal Row and Rai Bahadur Runganada Mudaliar. And there breathed not sturdier patriots than Gazulu Lakshminarasu Chetty and Salem Ramasawmy Mudaliar."

With a single exception—Mr. Seshia Sastri—they are all dead and gone. But their memory is dearly cherished by their countrymen, and their influence is a living force for good to-day. It is irrelevant to enquire whether they were "great" men, or to classify them in the world's scale of notoriety. They were at least the salt of the society they adorned, and we should be glad if means could be found of making known to Englishmen at home the qualities that endeared them to their compatriots and influenced their own society.

We shall confine ourselves to picking out a few illustrative points. Sir Rama Varma did much for reform in Travancore. "Department after department was taken up and reorganised—the Judiciary, the Revenue, the Police, the salt, down to the anche and the elephant; in spite of the clamours of the time, who can say that each was not left on the whole either better ordered or better manned?" The Revenue Survey and Settlement was a great scheme, boldly conceived and executed. His Highness, "in earnest and indefatigable application to business, was a model for the whole service to follow. . . . . His daily routine was a routine of incessant labour. Scarcely any lamp in the town was put out later in the night, or lit up earlier in the morning, than the reading-lamp on the Maharája's writing-desk." He took a personal and very practical interest in science. Sir Vizia Rama of Vizianagram was in charge of his zemindary for thirty years, and "it may be said without exaggeration that he lived and died a model prince." These rulers present a very different picture from the traditional voluptuary of popular imagination.

Sir Madava Row, "the Turgot of India," as Mr. Fawcett styled him, did admirable service as Dewan of three native States—Travancore, Indore, and Baroda; and perhaps he is the best known of the series. Mr. V. Ramiengar did excellent work both as administrator and as legislator, and Sir Alexander Arbuthnot publicly said of him that "whether as regards the uprightness of his character, the excellence of his judgment, the honesty of his purpose, or the independence of his action, he has not his superior in any one of the legislative bodies now at work in this great Indian Empire." Runga Charlu, the son of a clerk in the Chingleput Collectorate, ably administered, under trying conditions, the province of Mysore; and it was he who, as Dewan, organised the Representative Assembly. Seshia Sastri, also the son of poor parents, succeeded Sir Madava Row as Dewan of Travancore, and later became Dewan of Pudukota. On his retirement from the latter post, Lord Wenlock said: "The result of his labours has been so successful that what was at the time of his accession to office almost a wreck is at the present moment a prosperous possession." The capacity, energy, resolution, and integrity of such administrators well deserve a permanent record; and stay-at-home Englishmen ought to be made acquainted with the facts.

Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar left behind him the reputation of a great judge—a reputation that rests on most solid foundations. Runganada Sastri, who rose to the Legislative Council, was the greatest linguist of India. He was master of fourteen languages at his death, and was busy at a fifteenth. Gopal Row spent his energies in the Educational Department, mainly in connexion with the Kumbakonam College. "It is no disparagement to many well-known names," wrote Dr. Miller, "when we say that few of the educated sons of Southern India held so high a place in the regard of natives and Europeans equally, and that fewer still have done so much to mould the generations that are to come." Runganada Mudaliar, too, was a teacher—a Professor in the Presidency College. "His devotion to public duty, his services as a teacher and a professor, as an educationist, and as a friend of progress, were invaluable." Such was the opinion of Sir Muthusawmy Aiyar. The reputation of Lakshminarasu Chetty and Ramasawmy Mudaliar rests on the courage, strenuousness, and level-headedness of their action as public men.

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
IS
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

There is much satisfaction in the commemoration of men whose work has been done in the less prominent walks of life, but whose influence may not on that account be the less pervading, powerful, and permanent. In this connexion, too, it is very pleasant to note the far-reaching effects of the work of several English teachers—especially of Mr. Powell, Principal of the Madras High School, afterwards Director of Public Instruction, "the pioneer of higher education in Southern India," who had as pupils a large proportion of these distinguished and useful men. Speaking of this veteran educationist, Runga Charlu said:

"When I recall to my mind the singleness of purpose and devotion with which he gave himself up to the education of those placed under his care during a period attended with many discouragements and difficulties . . . . and when I reflect that he was able to continue with undiminished interest these by no means easy labours during the period of nearly a a quarter of a century, it is impossible not to be overpowered with a feeling of admiration and gratitude. Remarkable as he was for the thoroughness and precision of his teaching and the extensive range of information which he was able to place before his students, that which most impressed their mind was, I think, the silent but enduring influence of his high and exemplary character."

Such are the services that go beyond all others to the making of a nation.

It is further interesting to see that at least five of the men here commemorated rose from the humblest beginnings:

"Sir Muthusawmy Aiyar began life on a salary of Re. 1 *per mensem*. Ramiengar's father was hardly able to educate his son. It would have been impossible for Runga Charlu to get himself educated without the generous help he received from some of his distant relatives, Runganada Sastri owed his education entirely to the generosity of a District Judge. Seshia Sastri was equally poor. All these were men whom poverty had inured to hardship, and necessity had compelled to exertion; and the habits they had acquired in the early school of difficulty had served them in good stead in later years."

Another moral to be drawn from those lives—a moral of the highest practical concern—may also be given in the words of Mr. Pillai:

"The British Government in spite of their just laws and love of fair play, afford little scope for distinction to natives and give them little encouragement. We wonder what would have been the fate of Sir Madava Row, Runga Charlu, Ramiengar, and Seshia Sastri, if there were no Native States in India. Ramiengar would have retired as Superintendent of Stamps or Inspector-General of Registration; to Seshia Sastri no more responsible place would have been open than that of Head Sheristadar of the Board of Revenue; the ambition of Runga Charlu would have leapt no higher than the appointment of a Deputy Collector; and Sir Madava Row would have at best been an efficient revenue officer. These officers would have afforded little room for the display of their intellectual attainments, or for the exercise of their statesman-like instincts and they would have lived and died like any other plodding, prospering official in the Revenue Department under Government. . . . .

"Even Gopal Row and Runganada Mudaliar, whose abilities were of the highest, were the lesser lights they were on account of the restrictions placed on them by the British Government. In spite of his great reputation as a teacher, his recognised ability, and the success and distinction with which he had conducted the duties of principal for three years in the Kumbakonam College, Gopal Row was never confirmed as Principal, and it was several years subsequently that he was admitted even into the graded service as Professor of History and Political Economy in the Presidency College. Runganada Mudaliar was not treated a whit better. A man of his genius had to act as professor for sixteen years in some capacity or other before he was confirmed as Professor of Mathematics in the Presidency College! Even Sir T. Muthusawmy Aiyar could only *act* as Chief Justice. He was permitted to soar no higher."

Mr. Pillai's volume is very suggestive as well as informing, and he deserves great credit for placing it before the public in a form likely to circulate its contents much more widely than even the columns of the *Madras Standard*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1896.

ARENA. Ghose, Dr. J. N. "Mysore."

CHAMBERS'S JOURNAL. "Opium Eating."

GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE. Reid, D. N. "How India has Suffered in the Race for Wealth."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Hope, Evelyn. "Modern Literature in the N. W. P." "Sir Charles Aitchison's Career." "Indian Gentlemen in the West" (classified list).

NATIONAL REVIEW. Peel, G. "The Money of the Far East."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Hewitt, J. F. "Buddhism: The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1896.

LATIF, SYAD MUHAMMAD ..... "History of the Panjab from the Remotest Antiquity to the Present Time. (Sampson Low)	18s. 0d.
"STATISTICAL ATLAS OF INDIA." Second Edition, 1895 (Edward Stanford)	5s. 0d.
"LIST OF ANCIENT MONUMENTS IN BENGAL." (Bengal Secretariat Press, Calcutta)	Rs. 12
MAYNE, JOHN D..... "The Criminal Law of India." (Wm. Clowes & Sons)....	— —
"REPRESENTATIVE MEN OF SOUTHERN INDIA." (Madras, Price Current Press)	Rs. 3
"THE *Lancet* AND THE HYDERABAD COMMISSION" (423, Strand).....	— —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

[127.]	EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE)—Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India for the Eleven Years from 1884-85 to 1894-95	7d.
[151.]	EAST INDIA (CONTRIBUTIONS BY INDIA TO THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE)—Correspondence relating to the Contribution from Indian Revenues to the Imperial Institute.....	8½d.
[154.]	EAST INDIA (WARLIKE OPERATIONS)—Return of the Number of Sailors and Soldiers Killed or Wounded in War or Warlike Operations carried on by the Government of India during 1891 to 1894	1d.
[171.]	EAST INDIA (INDIA OFFICE, RETIREMENT AT 65)—Minute by the Secretary of State for India relating to the Retention of certain Officers beyond the age of 65	½d.

Printed by A. RONNER. 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 8. (NEW SERIES.) AUGUST, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, Six Shillings per ann. In India, Six Rupees.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	225
The Indian Troops at Suakin:	
I.—The Proposed Court of Arbitration by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P.	231
II.—Injustice to India, by J. Dacosta	233
Swâmi Vivekanânda in London	235
K. S. Ranjitsinhji	237
Our London Letter	238
Lord Welby's Commission	240
"A Masterpiece of Melancholy Meanness"	241
Natural Law in the Political World	243
Indian Troops at Suakin:	
I.—The Debate in the Commons	245
II.—In the Lords	246
III.—Summary of Parliamentary Papers	247
IV.—Opinions of the Press	254
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	240
Recent Official Publications	240

Indiana.

The Borrowed Troops.

THE final decision of the Cabinet to charge upon the Indian revenues the ordinary expenses of the Indian force despatched to Suakin seems to lend colour to the theory that the debate in the House of Commons was postponed from June 4th to July 6th not so much in deference to the request of the Government of India as because discussion would have been inconvenient to the Cabinet at the earlier date. In the present number of INDIA some attempt is made to come to terms with the large mass of material which the discussion has produced. On another page will be found signed articles by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. J. Dacosta upon particular issues raised in the debates in both Houses, while in our editorial columns and "Our London Letter" respectively we deal with the larger questions and the minor incidents of a controversy that promises to render impossible in the future a repetition of the shabby transaction out of which it arose. Elsewhere we print descriptions of the scenes in both Houses of Parliament by an eye-witness, a critical analysis of the Parliamentary papers issued in anticipation of the debates, and a series of typical extracts intended to convey to Indian readers some slight idea of the truly remarkable volume of considered rebuke which has assailed the Government's unhandsome policy from the press of all parties, and in all quarters of the country.

The Indian Budget.

The Indian Budget is, at the time of writing, expected to come on for discussion in the House of Commons on some day in the second week of August. On July 16th Sir W. Wedderburn put questions to Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons for the purpose of obtaining some sort of undertaking that the whole of the discussion should not be rushed through in a single sitting. Mr. Balfour's answer was evasive. He could not hold out any hope of being able to give more time than had been given in previous years. But during recent years, at any rate, two days have been granted—one for the general debate on the motion for going into committee, the other for discussion of the Budget itself. The crop of questions which call for notice this year is certainly not less than usual. Apart from the general scope and contents of the Financial Statement—which, since April last, has not ceased to receive attention in our columns—there are at least two questions of prime importance which may be expected to provoke discussion, namely, the occupation of Chitral and the re-arrangement of the cotton duties. Sir Henry Fowler, in the remarkable

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

speech which he delivered on Sir W. Wedderburn's motion for the adjournment of the House, suggested that he was waiting for the debate on the Indian Budget to discuss the latter question. On both questions, as it happens, his policy has been reversed by his successor. Sir W. Wedderburn recalled Sir H. Fowler's statement to Mr. Balfour, but Mr. Balfour, whose indifference to Parliamentary proceedings is passing into a byword, had not heard of it. The way in which the Indian Budget is, at the best of times, hurried through the House of Commons is discreditable enough; but if only one day is allowed this year, and Sir Henry Fowler delivers a voluminous speech on the cotton duties, it is obvious that there will be time for little else except Lord George Hamilton's official statement. It is the duty of the Government to prevent this stifling of discussion—a duty which the withdrawal of the *Education Bill* ought to have rendered comparatively easy.

The Jhalawar Case.

THE deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar by the Government of India, without any enquiry by an impartial tribunal or any possibility of appeal, has led, as it was bound to do, to a debate in the House of Commons. Lord G. Hamilton and some of the Irish members alike deprecated Mr. Herbert Roberts's motion for the adjournment on July 21st, though on different grounds. The occasion was, of course, inopportune in the judgment of the Secretary of State, but as the criticism would have been applied to any other occasion by a critic who is singularly ready to defend the bureaucratic acts of the Government of India, though he is not so ready to accede to its just requests, Lord G. Hamilton's remonstrances do not call for serious notice. Many of the Irish members, however, whose generous aid to the Indian reform party we have often had the pleasure of acknowledging, were disposed to look with hostility upon a motion which seemed to threaten the progress of the Irish Land Bill. We make no doubt that the objectors would now admit that the excellence of some portions of the Irish Land Bill is no answer to the deposed Mahárájá's claim for justice. Lord George Hamilton went out of his way with so little tact to labour the annoyance of the Irishmen that they must have perceived his purpose, and are not likely, at his implied invitation, to cease to take friendly notice of Indian questions. The moral pointed by the Jhalawar case is as simple as it is grave. The British Government simply cannot afford to create among the loyal Princes and Chiefs of the Native States the impression that their rights may be capriciously destroyed and that, if allegations are brought against them, they may be condemned unheard. The refusal of the Government of India to submit its case against the Mahárájá of Jhalawar to an impartial tribunal is strange in exact proportion to the Government's belief in the justice of what it has done. If the Mahárájá has been rightly deposed, why should the Government shun enquiry? If enquiry cannot safely be faced, why is not the Mahárájá restored? In no matter does it behove the Government of India to walk more circumspectly than in its dealings with Native States, and in no case are the advantages of an impartial tribunal more obvious or more substantial than in a case between a Native Prince and a Political Agent. Those who read the Blue-book may be moved to reflect upon the duties of this important officer. One would think that his first duty was to guide and help a young Prince, and to regard his shortcomings as, in some sort, a discredit to his responsible adviser.

"Moral and Material Progress."

ON the face of the annual "Statement of the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India" all is well. Indeed, there is hardly a single department of national activity where the official eye fails to discern signs of improvement. Where the figures happen to go the wrong way, they still manage somehow to set off the superior rectitude of the figures that go the right way. The difficulty is to know the true significance of the masses of statistics, whether by the help of the official gloss or in spite of it. The record of legislation, viceregal or provincial, is extremely modest. The most important general Acts were, of course, those dealing with the cotton duties. In Bengal and in the North-West Provinces and Oudh some amendment and expansion of municipal Acts was accomplished; in Bombay a territorial extension was given to certain laws; but not a single Act from Madras received the assent of the Governor-General. The energy of the legislators appears to have been directed elsewhere. The main point, no doubt, is quality; but the tale of legislative achievement would hardly seem to keep pace with the development of the needs of the country and with advancing opinion. Meantime, it is gratifying to find that, although there has been no enlargement of municipal authority, nor any increase in the number of municipalities, the general municipal results of the year still gain a very decent official approval. "The conduct of business by the municipal committees was, in the majority of cases, considered by the governments of the various provinces to be satisfactory." The approval is subject to a certain qualification, indeed—a qualification well worth signalising with emphasis, although it might easily be paralleled in places where municipal government

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

has been in operation for centuries. "The interest taken in municipal matters by the electors," we are told, "was far from keen." This lack of serious interest in home matters necessarily tells on the argument for a more general application of the principle of Home Rule, and we should be glad to see it reformed away. At the same time, "measures for the improvement of the water supply, which is still very deficient over India, were taken or sanctioned during the year in each province, and many important drainage works were proceeded with." There is life in the system, clearly; but the official criticism ought to prompt the electors to strike its roots deeper, and to show to all men, beyond cavil, that they are in real earnest about the principle involved.

Sanitation and Agriculture.

IN most of the provinces, substantial advances are reported in the much-needed work of sanitation. It is worth remarking that the Maháraní Surnamoyi, C.I., had the generosity to undertake to defray the estimated cost of a scheme for the water supply of Berhampore—an example that ought to be fruitful, not merely for similar contributions, but for impressing on the Indian mind the importance of sanitary works. The European troops had a bad year. Enteric fever was the cause of 36 per cent. of the deaths; venereal diseases and ague of 34 and 27 per cent. of the hospital cases. No fewer than 1,808 men, or 25·43 per 1,000 of strength, were invalided, 39 per cent. of them being discharged as unfit for further service. India is evidently no place for raw recruits, and even men over 25 need a great deal of acclimatising; yet 60 per cent. of the invalided were under 25, and 81 per cent. of the total strength had seen less than five years' service. There is a problem of economy here, apparently. The comparison of the death-rate from enteric fever among the Native troops with that of the European troops —0·05 with 5·75 per 1,000—suggests a drastic investigation of the different conditions of physique and habit of the two classes. Among the general population, the death-rate for all the provinces rose from 25·75 per 1,000 in 1893 to 33·98; and in the North-West Provinces and Oudh, the figure went as high as 42·51. Fever was the great enemy. The supreme importance of sanitation was very painfully vindicated. How did it stand with agriculture? The statistics are not so complete as could be wished, more than one-ninth of the whole area of India being, for some inscrutable reason, still outside the figures returned. The wheat harvest varied greatly in different provinces, while the area cultivated with wheat was a little over the normal of recent years, though less than in 1893-94. In the last ten years the export has gone down very materially, notwithstanding the spurt of 1891-92 in response to the dearth in Eastern Europe. The figure for 1894-95 is little more than half that for the preceding year, and it is less than one-third of 1885-86. The reasons offered are the abundance of America, and of Argentina especially, and the low prices in Europe; but it is said that a marked recovery set in early in 1895-96. The important oil seeds crop was considerably—almost one-third—under the normal, owing to the ravages of excessive moisture and blight. Still the export was largely over that of any former year, except the year immediately preceding. The rice harvest, on the other hand, "gave a bumper yield in Bengal," where close upon two-thirds of the normal rice area lies. The export, though comparatively small, was 36 per cent. over the preceding years. "Two-thirds of the exports went from Burma; more than half the exports were sent to Europe, and most of the remainder to Ceylon and Further Asia." The treasury netted almost the record duty on rice exports. The cotton area contracted somewhat, but still it kept above the normal; the season, however, was unfavourable, through heavy or untimely rains, and the yield was much below the average everywhere, and considerably below the previous year. The exports of raw cotton show much variation during the past decade, and last year the figure was unprecedently low. Tea is looking up, and the export is steadily rising. The United Kingdom is India's best customer for tea. The variations of taste in the past generation are curious. In 1865 we took 93 per cent. of our imported tea from China, and only 2 per cent. from India. In 1885 we took only 66 per cent. from China, but 30 per cent. from India, and 2 per cent. from Ceylon, which now comes into the account. The percentages have almost steadily gone forward in the same direction, and in 1895, while China's contribution has fallen to 16 per cent., India's has advanced to 46 per cent., and Ceylon's to 32 per cent. At the same time, the average import price of China tea is 8·6d. per lb., while Indian and Ceylon tea fetch an average price of 10d. per lb. There can be no doubt, however, that, if the mind of the Government could be given more freely to the general conditions of agriculture, there ought to be immense advances in all the forms of production.

A Record of Exhaustion.

THE railways furnish the largest figures to the budget of public works. The total expenditure of Rx. 23,592,649 exceeded the total revenue by Rx. 2,348,489. Much of the mileage has been laid down primarily for strategic purposes, and is not expected to pay in direct returns. This is especially the case on the Punjab side. Everywhere a railway fosters development, and opens up a way for ideas to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

penetrate; and it is one of the best forms of famine insurance. But, after all, the question comes round to the point, How far can India afford it? A large part of the material has to be paid in gold, and it is only an insignificant fraction of the dividends that finds its way into Indian pockets. The railway problem calls for an attention it cannot possibly receive while the directing minds of the country are squabbling on the frontiers. Nor is the irrigation system free from elements of anxiety. "The immense systems of large artificial water channels, with which some parts of India are covered, would appear at first sight to offer unrivalled opportunities for water carriage." Undoubtedly. "But though efforts have been made to organise navigation services on the larger irrigation canals, it cannot be said that, on the whole, they have met with a large measure of success. In many cases, the receipts from the traffic have failed to cover the working expenses." The unsuitability of alignment and level for navigation can hardly be the sole, or the main, reason; and one would like to know the nature and extent of the said efforts of organisation. Still, the object of irrigation works is to irrigate; and, on this, the main point of the business, we are told that "there are great differences in the financial success of the irrigation works in the various provinces." On the whole, however, the percentage of net receipts on capital outlay for 1894-95 is set down at 4·3—a figure fractionally less than those of the two previous years. The "minor" works are more successful financially than the "major," which are handicapped by large initial outlay. The movements of trade have a special Parliamentary paper to themselves, and are merely outlined here. The disturbance caused by the closing of the mints and the re-imposition of import duties in 1893-94, and by the re-imposition of the cotton duties, with the countervailing excise, in December 1894, left its mark. "Among the decreases of imports that in metals and hardware was the most notable; yet the duty on iron and steel, the imports of which fell 13 per cent., was only one per cent. *ad valorem*"—a sufficiently good illustration of the sensitiveness of the market. "There were large increases in the exports of rice, jute goods, and considerable increases under most other staples, so that the gross value of merchandise exports, exclusive of re-exports, was 103¾ millions against 102 millions in the preceding year, and was higher than it had ever been before, notwithstanding the great decline in the exports of raw cotton and wheat." The net excess of exports over imports of merchandise, Government transactions, and treasure, is given at Rx. 33,352,642—an extremely large figure. What does it mean but a serious draining of the country? "In the trade of every country with the rest of the world," says Professor Thorold Rogers, "if the community is doing well, the imports are always in excess of exports, when interpreted in money value or prices." If the community is doing well! How, then, is India doing, on this official statement? And the tale is the same year by year, with variation only in the figures of the adverse balance. The figures given from 1890-91 to 1893-94 are Rx. 9,057,843, Rx. 27,123,285, Rx. 29,978,613, Rx. 14,467,943—a continuous record of exhaustion.

The Plague of Militarism.

The deplorable position of the finances, with the true causes of depletion, has been fully exposed and commented on in these columns. Land Revenue, Forest, and Registration are the only heads of revenue that show a decrease. The Land Revenue, in spite of official exertions, went down Rx. 206,128. "On the whole," we are told, "the tendency of the land revenue is to increase gradually and slowly:" in the past generation it has been increasing at the rate of about a million every five years. But this increase is partly due to territorial extension, as in the case of Upper Burma; and there is an ominous lack of elasticity in this, by far the most important, source of revenue. In Bengal, there were in the year under notice 1,466 sales of land for arrears, the estates being mostly small and of little value. The relations of landlord and tenant were "strained in particular localities, owing to the levy of illegal cesses by landholders, the illegal enhancement of rents, no-rent combinations among tenants, exorbitant exactions by landholders," and so forth. The Bengal Tenancy Act "continues to work smoothly;" but the number of suits under the Rent Tenancy Law has gone up to 238,399, a strong and steady increase. In the North-West Provinces, the coercive processes rose from 71,000 to 75,000; the attachments of property for arrears, from 7,016 to 9,642, though the sales of defaulters' property went down from 354 to 336. "The number of suits and applications under the rent law was 271,592, or 3 per cent. above the total of 1892-93, and was larger than in any previous year. Of the suits, over 90 per cent. were, as in previous years, for arrears of rent." Similar statements are made in respect of the other provinces—except Madras, whose figures have attained a special interest. The euphemistic "coercive process," we may note, was in special request in fertile Berar. There, we learn, "the number of coercive processes issued against defaulters showed an increase, there having issued 15,638 writs of demand against 10,324 in the previous year; in 46 cases, personal property was sold for arrears; 298 fields were also sold; but no defaulters were sent to prison." An increase of over 50 per cent. is, indeed, an increase! And this in fertile Berar! We are

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

sick of customs and excise, as well as of the salt tax. The impression remains that, in spite of the large figures and the multifarious business recorded in this Blue-book, the community is *not* doing well—not anything like so well as it might do. The sources of hindrance and mischief are hidden away under a smooth and smiling surface of cheerful figures. It is alike useless to ban or to entreat. But the first step towards a satisfactory administration is the abandonment of military enterprise, and the release of the official energies for internal oversight and direction.

The Cotton Duties.

THE proposals laid before the Legislative Council by the millowners of Bombay and Calcutta with regard to the cotton duties were rejected, according to the statement of the Viceroy, mainly because they lacked "some reasonable chance of finality." But it must not be assumed that the arrangements actually made by the Government of India are regarded even by their authors as final. For the Viceroy himself found it "impossible to give the honourable member (Mr. Playfair) the pledge he asks"; Mr. Playfair having requested some assurance that the measures of the Government would ensure finality. This admission makes it impossible silently to acquiesce in the existing state of affairs, even though Lord George Hamilton be backed by a Ministerial majority which, in the debate on the payment of Indian troops despatched to Suakin, has proved its capacity for voting against its convictions at the bidding of its leader. The printed return of the protest recorded in the Minutes of the India Council by Sir James Peile and Sir Alexander Arbuthnot against the despatch of April 2nd, together with the answer of Lord George Hamilton, adds little material to the discussion which has been carried on in these columns. But it throws some light on the methods by which the present Government is in the habit of attaining its ends, and it is valuable as the record of an official and expert criticism of the crudities of Lord George Hamilton's direction of affairs. The Secretary of State, in his reply, lays great stress on what he regards as the self-evident fairness and equity of his decision. He appears to be sincerely enamoured of the uniformity of his 3½ per cent on all mill-made cloth, which was his answer to the problem how "to put the two great competing industries on terms of perfect equality." Either he is a master of the art of self-deception, or he is less candid than might be desired. No other hypothesis can explain his re-assertion of belief in the justice of the famous despatch. No doubt, as Sir James Peile points out, the formula, "tax all cloth and free all yarn," looks eminently plausible. But examined in the light of the previous enactment it amounts simply to this:—tax Indian cloth, which was hitherto untaxed, and free Lancashire yarn, for Indian yarn was already free. Not even an appeal to the sacred name of Free Trade can be held to justify a tax which competent opinion unanimously pronounces iniquitous, while even the frequent invocations of that doctrine display glaring inconsistencies. Did not the Secretary of State record in writing on May 5th his conviction that the 3½ per cent. duty on mill-woven goods would not enable hand looms to compete successfully with power mills? Why, then, does he endeavour to make a point on April 16th by declaring, "Moreover, the hand looms compete not merely with the Indian mills, but also with the Lancashire mills"? Either the duty is protective or it is not. If it is protective, what becomes of Lord George Hamilton's unswerving championship of economic truth, his sole ostensible reason for the re-arrangement of the tax? If it is not protective, then there can be no possible reason for the reduction from 5 to 3½ per cent, and the increased incidence of the tax. As a matter of fact, the Government of India knock the bottom out of their own position by tacitly admitting the objection. Sir James Westland said, "Manchester may justly object to being prevented from trying the experiment [of exporting coarse counts to India] by our insisting on interposing in the way of it a duty to which we do not subject the goods of Indian manufacture." Lord George Hamilton wrote on May 5th, "The possible competition of mills in native States cannot at present be a serious factor in the problem." The upshot of the whole matter is that Lancashire must be guarded against any possibility of protective interference either in the present or in the future. Indian manufactures must wait for satisfaction until the grievance becomes a pressing evil. Perhaps those who know the methods of the Indian Government would assign an even longer term.

The Burden on India.

THE interests of the mass of Indian consumers have been subordinated to the demands of Lancashire, and no argument is too paltry, no fallacy too obvious, to be called into requisition to bolster up the injustice. Lancashire objects to the remission of the tax on coarser counts, because she anticipates in consequence an increased demand for those counts and less demand for the higher counts which she supplies. The Secretary of State declares the remission futile, because as the higher counts rise in price through the imposition of the duties the lower counts rise in sympathy with them. Sir J. Westland shows that the increase caused by the tax would be microscopic—less than a halfpenny per head per annum on all consumers. To reconcile such argu-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ments as these is beyond the power of the human intellect. An infinitesimal rise in price cannot possibly produce the dislocation which is prophesied by the Manchester interest. And if a general rise in price is certain to take place whether the lower counts are exempt or not, then there was no reason for extending the tax so as to include those counts, on the pretext of a probable dislocation. If Lord George Hamilton's statement represents the opinion of the Government, India might still have been allowed to have her own way in a matter which on his own showing was indifferent. Yet with famine threatening in the North-West, with increased expenditure on account of Chitral, with trouble looming in Thibet, plans brewing at Simla with Herat as their objective, and money required for mobilisation with heaven knows what object, the Government had the audacity to take advantage of a sudden rise in the rupee and some other equally fortuitous increases of income, and to present the consumers or manufacturers of Lancashire goods with 50 lakhs of rupees. Mr. Playfair estimated the reduction, under the rearrangement, of duty on Lancashire goods at 51½ lakhs, or 37 per cent. The increase of duty on Indian goods by the inclusion of all cloth under the 3½ per cent. excise was 11 lakhs, or 300 per cent Yet after the statements and calculations put forward. by Sir James Westland with a view to minimising the restrictive tendencies of the 3½ per cent. impost on trade, we are expected to believe that the reduction of 1½ per cent. is a real boon to Lancashire. In one respect, no doubt, it was a great concession in the eyes of the Manchester party, coupled as it was with the extension of the excise. Pecuniarily it can have conferred little, if any, benefit on English cotton manufacturers. But it certainly did gratify a trade jealousy. As a sop to Cerberus it has been endowed with soothing powers out of all proportion to its real importance. On the other side, the addition of 11 lakhs to the burden of India has equally an importance in no way commensurate with its mere pecuniary value. In the first place, it must inevitably fall on the very poorest class of the community, those who live always on the verge of starvation. Secondly, it increases, as has been stated, at the enormous rate of 300 per cent. the contributions levied on Indian cotton manufactures under the previous regulations. Thirdly, it falls short by 40 lakhs of the sum remitted by the reduction of the duties from 5 to 3½ per cent., and herein leaves the Indian taxpayer ample ground for complaint. No one denies that India is taxed to the utmost limit of her capacity. Yet when the Government found itself enriched by a series of windfalls with that rarest of blessings in India—a surplus—it could devise no better means of employing its surplus than to present 50 lakhs to the classes best able to pay, and to spend 50 lakhs on mobilisation, while it extorted a paltry 11 lakhs from the peasant in order to gratify the cotton lords of Manchester.

"Hole-and-Corner" Legislation.

No doubt 11 lakhs is in itself a comparatively insignificant sum. It is equally true that the thirty or forty thousand sterling which India is to be called upon to pay to the troops at Suakin is a mere drop in the sea compared with the huge sum dealt with every year in the Indian Budget. But it is the last straw that breaks the camel's back, and there are only too manifest signs to show that the loyalty of India is being tested within dangerously short range of the breaking strain. The very excellent theory on which the Government of India is supposed to work is that England governs India for the benefit of the Indians. As Professor Murison pertinently enquires, would any self-governing colony be likely to submit to the treatment meted out to India on the cotton question? Money is urgently needed for the development of the country, and every rupee that can be spared should be devoted to that end, instead of being thrown away on mobilisation for future military insanity on the frontiers, or presented to the comparatively well-to-do classes. Even were the necessity not so urgent, or the addition of even a trifling burden to the overtaxed rayat a matter of life and death to him, yet the imposition of a tax which is felt to be unnecessary, even as things are, unjust, and due only to the military extravagance of the Indian Government, could not fail to produce extreme discontent. "The people of India," wrote an Anglo-Indian correspondent to Sir John Leng, "who pay the taxes have the first claim to decide how the taxes shall be levied and what those taxes shall be. The British Parliament has been until very recently regarded by the people of India as their last resort in search of equity and justice." Since those words were written the Government has decided in the face of public opinion to exact the iniquitous charge for pay of the troops at Suakin. This most unfortunate decision can only foster the already widespread feeling that India is really governed in the interests of England. Lord George Hamilton's remark on economic forces is equally true of moral forces. They are "dynamic, not stationary, and a small percentage of duty often creates a disturbance and revolution out of all proportion to the weight or amount of the duty imposed" if it violates a nation's sense of equity. Moreover, the device by which the despatch of April evaded the fair criticism of the India Council is not less an insult to that body and to British traditions than to India. The intentions of the Home Government were conveyed in a draft of a private telegram

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to the Governor-General from the Secretary of State, which was read to the Council, but not offered for discussion, at a purely formal meeting held in order to comply with the statute under which the Council sits, and from which Sir Alexander Arbuthnot was absent. Sir James Peile dissented from the proposed measures, but his unsupported objection was overruled, and the readjustment was shortly afterwards assented to without further discussion. Sir Alexander Arbuthnot has been assured that this piece of "hole-and-corner" legislation was an accident. It was a very deplorable accident. Unhappily it squares only too truly with other high-handed proceedings on the part of the present Ministry. The leading members of the Cabinet, it is said, avoid newspapers for fear of disturbing their mental balance and warping their decisions. In other words, they prefer to admit the purely bureaucratic view of affairs, untempered by contact with public opinion. The theory may not be a true one, but it fulfils at any rate one requirement of a true theory —it explains the facts. The tyranny of the Cabinet has become steadily more evident during the last twelve months, and in nothing more evident than in Indian affairs. Having determined on any course of action, however unpopular, it overpowers opposition by declaring that the division on the point at issue involves a vote of confidence. There are unmistakable signs that its long-suffering supporters are weary of voting against their consciences and are breaking away. England is growing disgusted with bureaucracy, and there is every reason to hope that her brief and disagreeable experience of "the "strongest government of modern times" may awaken sympathy with the long-suffering taxpayers of India.

THE INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

I.—THE PROPOSED COURT OF ARBITRATION.

By Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.

A debate upon India in the House of Lords is always interesting, and important; because, whether the decision be wise or unwise, we get in such a debate the views of the men who have held high office as regards Indian affairs: Secretaries of State, Viceroys, Governors, and Commanders-in-Chief. What comes out on such an occasion is all to the good of India. For everything that is said in favor of class prejudice, race ascendancy, or obscurantism, is put down to the natural proclivities of a privileged assembly, and attracts little attention; while any declarations which make for equal justice and magnanimity, whether coming from the Government or the Opposition, remain as a valuable legacy, a store-house of authoritative opinion, for the benefit of India in times to come.

In the case of the Suakin debate we have been more than usually fortunate. For although, no doubt, the majority acted according to their natural instincts, and voted for the Tory Government, irrespective of the merits of the particular case, we have on the other hand secured a clear declaration in favour of reciprocity; and, still more important, we gain this advantage that a distinct proposal has been put forward having for its object to insure to India in practice equal justice in matters of finance. This proposal, to establish an arbitration tribunal between India and Great Britain, in order to settle disputes regarding the apportionment of charges between the two Countries, was first brought into prominence by Mr. Arthur Balfour in the debate on Suakin in the House of Commons. He then asked "whether the time has not arrived when we might with advantage, both to India and to England, constitute some kind of tribunal of arbitration . . . for the determination of questions of this sort, in which the interests of India and Great Britain should be alike and equally represented." This general suggestion was brought into the sphere of practical politics by Lord Salisbury when, in the House of Lords, he stated that early in the year he was "so impressed in favour of such a course that he laid before his colleagues a proposal for the appointment of a tribunal, which should be so impartially composed as to obtain the confidence of the taxpayers of both England and India." When, however, they came to consider the details, they felt that it would be best to await the report of the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure. And Lord Salisbury expressed a hope that that Commission "will furnish suggestions for regulations to which the Government of the day may be able to conform without any fear that the steps which they may think necessary for the defence of the Empire will be made the subject of discussions which may be injurious to the interests of that Empire." From the above it appears that, in the mind of the Prime Minister at least, the scheme for a tribunal has taken a tolerably concrete form. The idea was also approved by Lord Northbrook, who thought that a promise by Government to constitute such an authority would entirely counteract the ill-feeling raised in India by the miserable Suakin business; while Lord Lansdowne considered that some machinery might be devised which would enable her Majesty's Government and the Indian Government so to apply the principles of reciprocity that India would be placed for the future "in an infinitely sounder position with regard to these controversies than she had ever before occupied."

This sounds a good and benevolent offer. Ought

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

we to look such a gift horse in the mouth? Is it our painful duty to regard with suspicion this gracious offer, because it comes from the hand of a Tory Government? I am not quite sure. But reading the whole of Lord Salisbury's speech there is one point which necessarily arouses suspicion, and that is his frankly expressed dislike of parliamentary discussion. Can it be true that his main object is to withdraw these financial questions from under the control of Parliament? Certainly in discussing the inconvenience of existing arrangements he lays more stress on the disagreeables arising from parliamentary debate than upon the danger of injustice to the weaker party, and he puts himself forward as the champion of the British rather than of the Indian taxpayer. This is what he says: "There is nothing which has occurred in the course of the debate with which I more sympathize than the regret which has been expressed that this matter should have been made the subject of parliamentary discussion and of party sophistry and ingenuity. It appears likely that such a discussion may do some little harm. It is not a very admirable thing—and indeed there is something rather squalid in the fact—that there should be a contest between two parts of the Empire as to what share each should bear in the expense in its defence. Moreover such a discussion must lead to the inevitable injury which, as the noble earl opposite has pointed out, must result from disclosing departmental communications which are not always couched in a judicial tone." And he concludes by saying that "we must try to adopt some way by which these discussions may be avoided in the future." This important declaration indicates the possibility of a very serious danger. Does it refer to an intention of tampering with the provisions of Sec. 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858? Let us recall the wording of that section. It provides that "except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of her Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden or urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, *without the consent of both Houses of Parliament*, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by her Majesty's forces charged upon such revenues." Is it intended to avoid these discussions in the future by altering this section and by doing away with the necessity of obtaining the consent of both Houses of Parliament? I most sincerely trust that there is no such idea. Also we are at liberty to hope that the desired result may be sought by a different process, which will be both legitimate and creditable. Lord Salisbury has called the discussion "squalid." But the discussion is only squalid in so far as it is an attempt to justify the meanness of placing an unfair burden upon the weaker party. Such an objectionable discussion may be effectually avoided in either of two ways; (*a*) by constituting such an impartial and effective tribunal to enquire into the merits of each case that the recommendations submitted by it to both Houses of Parliament will carry with them their own justification, or (*b*) by abrogating the provisions of section 55, and burking parliamentary discussion altogether. As either of these alternatives will attain the desired object I see no reason why Lord Salisbury should not choose the better part. I shall always remember that it was by his act, when Secretary of State for India, that Mysore was restored to its Native rulers, with such happy results; and I shall cherish the hope that in the present case he will act in a just and constitutional direction. It is also to be noted that in his speech he referred approvingly to Lord Kimberley's views, and Lord Kimberley pointed out that Parliament was the authority which must be the ultimate judge in such matters: "the ultimate decision . . . . could not be removed from the Government and the Parliament of this country. It was a question of discretion in the application of a principle from which we could not swerve. The Imperial power was here, and it must remain here."

Assuming that this more favourable view of the intentions of the Government is the correct one, the next point to consider is how such a tribunal shall be found as, in the words of Lord Salisbury, will "obtain the confidence of the taxpayers of both England and India"? It is in such cases generally better if possible to utilize an existing machinery, especially if that machinery is one of proved efficiency and accepted authority, rather than to constitute a new tribunal. And on behalf of the taxpayers of India I think I may say there is no authority in England which more commands the confidence of the Indian public as regards wisdom and strict impartiality, than the Judicial Committee of her Majesty's Privy Council. Fortunately, the Statute 3 and 4 William IV., c. 41, which defines the functions of the Judicial Committee, not only provides that it shall hear judicial appeals, under section 3, but also under section 4, authorises it to entertain any other matter whatsoever upon a special reference by the Crown. Section 4 runs as follows: "That it shall be lawful for his Majesty to refer to the said Judicial Committee, for hearing or consideration, any such other matters whatsoever, as his Majesty shall think fit; and such Committee shall thereupon hear and consider the same." And Lord Justice Knight Bruce, in the case of the Nawab of Surat (Moore's Appeals, vol. v, p. 499) observed with reference to these very wide powers, that if "it shall hereafter be the pleasure of her Majesty to refer the present petition, or any similar petition, to their lordships, their lordships will of course hear it, and report to her Majesty upon it." And in disposing of the par-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ticular case he pointed out to the petitioners how they might get the benefit of section 4: "The petitioners, therefore, will take such course as they may be advised, with reference to an application to the Crown, through the Board of Control or otherwise. By possibility, in consequence of such application, if made, the matter may come here again; and their lordships will readily do their duty in hearing it."

As it is desired in this matter to provide a tribunal which will not only be impartial but will command the confidence of both British and Indian taxpayers; as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council fulfils these conditions; as the Statute provides that the Crown can refer to it any such matters whatsoever as her Majesty shall think fit; and as their lordships are prepared readily to hear such matters on the merits, and to report to her Majesty; there seems no reason why any question in dispute between India and Great Britain should not be so dealt with. One great advantage would be that upon the difficult and delicate questions that would thus come before the Judicial Committee the case for each side could be argued by counsel, and the recommendation which would be laid before both Houses of Parliament would carry with it all the authority of a judicial decision by an absolutely independent tribunal. The issues in dispute would be mainly of a judicial kind, such as in the present case, as to where the interest of India ends and the interest of England begins, but if financial matters of a difficult kind were involved, an assessor could easily be added, specially qualified to deal with such questions. On receiving the report of the Judicial Committee it would of course be open to both Houses of Parliament to discuss and decide regarding it, but there would lie upon any one objecting to the recommendation a heavy burden to show that the award should not be accepted; and as the recommendation would not come from either political party, there would be no reason why the discussion should be squalid or that it should be made the subject of party sophistry and ingenuity. In conclusion I will only express my firm conviction that if it had not been for section 55 of the Government of India Act, and the necessity of obtaining the consent of both Houses of Parliament, we should not have enjoyed the advantage either of the excellent reciprocity principles laid down by Lord George Hamilton in his recent despatch, or of the proposals for an Arbitration Tribunal set forth in the recent debate.

II.—INJUSTICE TO INDIA.

By J. Dacosta.

"No potentate is exempt from the law that injustice will bring the highest on earth to ruin."

These words, uttered by the Prime Minister of England in his Mansion House speech in November last, must have created in the minds of many the impression that Lord Salisbury, remembering the ruin which injustice to our Indian allies and fellow subjects had wrought on the Anglo-Indian Administration in 1857-58, was resolved upon averting national disasters from the same cause, so long as his countrymen entrusted him with power. That impression, however, can scarcely continue to prevail now that the cries of injustice from India have become almost incessant. The latest is the cry raised against the injustice of taxing the people of India for the purpose of aiding the Anglo-Egyptian army in its attempt to reconquer the Sudan—an attempt in which it signally failed some twelve years ago, and in the accomplishment of which the people of India have no concern or interest whatever.

This injustice is keenly felt by both the people and the Government of India; and the latter, namely, the Governor-General and his Council, who are subordinates of the Secretary of State, have nevertheless, under the dictates of conscience, condemned the resolution of the Indian Secretary as impolitic and unjust.

The lavish expenditure of Indian revenue on previous wars carried on outside India has already so crippled the Indian Exchequer that the Government find themselves unable to provide for the first and most urgent needs of the country—namely, for the due administration of the laws. Lords Kimberley and Cross recently admitted that the vicious system of vesting Executive officers with judicial powers (under which the people complain of crying injustice) is contrary to good principle; and they asserted that the evil could not be remedied because the Government lacked the financial means of providing the necessary reform.

As regards the latest cry of injustice mentioned above, a leading article in the *Times* of July 7th, reviewing the debate which took place in the House of Commons on the previous night, expressed deep regret at "the Government having obstinately adhered to the policy of throwing a portion of the cost of the Egyptian expedition on the Indian Treasury," and recorded the following significant observations on the subject:—

"Mr. Balfour, with characteristic courage, put the whole matter in a nutshell when he said that the root of the opposition lies in a general feeling that the policy of the Government is mean. That is a perfectly accurate diagnosis, and we would simplify it by stating that the policy is thought mean because it is unjust. Neither Mr. Balfour nor Lord George Hamilton nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer succeeded in producing any defence that will avail to wipe away the stigma of meanness."

The writer then remarked, as under, on the statements by which those gentlemen attempted to palliate the Government resolution, by quoting precedents from the history of the Liberal Administration:

"This virtuous whittling down the matter only increases

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the feeling of astonishment and indignation that the Government should deliberately brave the strong opposition excited in India, outrage the sentiments of their supporters and defy public opinion at home. Fears have often been expressed of a growing disposition on the part of the Home Government to sacrifice the interests and just claims of India to the necessities of party politics in the House of Commons."

Those fears have certainly not been prematurely expressed. The growing disposition complained of is inherent to political power, which constantly strives to extend its limits, and is impelled in the strife by every step which it succeeds in taking beyond its constitutional bound. Lemontey justly observed: "L'usage de l'arbitraire augmente sans relâche le besoin de l'arbitraire."

It was in view of that dangerous disposition, which the Stuarts unscrupulously indulged in, that the British Constitution imposed on the Executive power the duty of applying to Parliament for war supplies before it involved the nation in actual warfare. The obvious intention of that provision was to guard against the nation being committed by actual hostilities to an aggressive war before its expediency and justice had been deliberately enquired into and acquiesced in by their elected representatives.

Now the acts referred to in the *Times'* article as "sacrificing the interests and just claims of India," consisted virtually in the diversion and misuse of her finances and in the exercise of undue pressure over her people in order to increase the Government revenue — acts by which the Home Government obtained war supplies from the Indian treasury, which enabled it to involve the nation in actual warfare without applying to Parliament as required by the British Constitution. The Executive, by violating that fundamental principle, practically usurped the right of the people of this realm to decide when, with whom, and the object for which they will go to war, and placed in the hands of the Ministry (often an ephemeral body) the power of committing the nation to a conflict which might, in their conviction, be morally and politically indefensible.

The evil is greater still. The Cabinet which obtains, through the compliance of the Indian Secretary, the command of the finances and credit of India might apply those resources to the raising of troops for employment at home, and proclaim martial law whenever a Ministry, supported by a large majority, resolved on crushing any strong political opposition which might by subtile ingenuity be represented to their supporters in the light of a criminal disturbance of the peace or a rebellion. To those who witnessed the violence of bread riots and who have watched the persevering determination of an influential faction to prevent the free importation of bread stuffs, in order to raise their price in the home markets, the presumed contingency will perhaps not appear utterly improbable.

The war in the Sudan, to which the nation is now committed, was entered upon suddenly with supplies diverted from the Egyptian and Indian Treasuries, before Parliament had an opportunity of deliberating on its expediency or its justice; and the ignorance of the nation regarding the precise motive of the war became apparent from questions being eagerly asked whether the invasion of the Sudan had for its object to assist Italy or to extend the Khedive's territory, or to justify our continued occupation of of Egypt or to secure the safety of the Egyptian frontier or to redeem our failure in the previous Sudan war. Even now that the war has been raging for months, and has involved the expenditure of much blood and treasure, its precise motive is still a matter of dispute and uncertainty—a state of things which reflects on the dignity of a great nation whose institutions are professedly based on the principle that the supreme power in the State lies in the will of the people as expressed by their representatives in Parliament.

The resolution under section 55 of the Act of 1858 was submitted in the House of Lords on July 16th, and the mover, referring to the history of the clause, said:—

"When the Bill was passed through the other House of Parliament, it had a clause proposed by Mr. Gladstone to the effect that, unless the consent of Parliament was given, her Majesty's forces charged on the Indian revenues should not be employed in any operation beyond the Indian frontier; and when the Bill came up to your lordships' House an amendment was moved by the Prime Minister at the time, who thought it necessary to apply a financial check to such an exercise of power."

From this statement it is evident that the amendment, which professed by a powerful check more effectually to carry out the intention of Parliament, actually frustrated that intention by removing the positive interdiction which the original clause had provided through subjecting the exercise of the power in question to the previous consent of Parliament.

Lord Salisbury, speaking on the resolution on July 16th, took his stand once more on the high ground of justice, and said:—

"I heartily join in everything that has been said by noble lords opposite as to the necessity of convincing the multitudes of India of our sense of justice and of our desire to do them justice and to respect their interests and rights. But I have an equal respect for the interests and rights of British taxpayers. I believe that the Sudan expedition will be of great benefit to Egypt and India. But by moving Indian troops we were not actuated by the desire to send them there for the purpose of taking their part in that expedition. [*See Lord Rosebery's speech exposing the sophistry of this statement.*] The question before us is this—Is the Indian or the British taxpayer to defend Suakin? The southern littoral of the Red Sea is of interest to India. It is true that, as matters stood a few years ago, that littoral depended on Egypt for its defence. Can it be said in such circumstances that India has no interest in the southern shores of the Red Sea or of the Gulf of Aden, which are continuations of the Suez Canal? If these shores fell into the hands of another Power, it would be India and not England that would suffer the most, because the former would be deprived of her military supplies. The defence of Aden is

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

paid for entirely by India. This shows what interest India has in the southern littoral of the Red Sea."

It might be argued with equal force that India is greatly interested in gratifying the Sultan of Turkey, seeing that she paid the entire cost of the ball which was given to that Sovereign.

Lord Salisbury concluded by saying:—

"If you refuse this vote the result will be that the account of the revenue of India will show so much money gained by lending Indian troops to this country."

That India can lend a portion of her army for carrying on a war of most uncertain duration in a distant land, shows that her army is in excess of her requirements; and the conclusion which suggests itself is that the large additions made to that army in 1885 and subsequently were sanctioned on insufficient pleas, or with the view of placing at the disposal of the Home Government surplus forces to be used for Imperial purposes, free of Parliamentary control, under section 55 of the Act of 1858 as modified in the House of Lords in the manner mentioned above.

SWÂMI VIVEKANÂNDA IN LONDON.

During the London season, Swâmi Vivekânanda has been teaching and lecturing to considerable numbers of people who have been attracted by his doctrine and philosophy. Most English people fancy that England has a practical monopoly of missionary enterprise, almost unbroken save for a small effort on the part of France. I therefore sought the Swâmi in his temporary home in South Belgravia to enquire what message India could possibly send to England, apart from the remonstrances she has too often had to make on the subject of home charges, judicial and executive functions combined in one person, the settlement of expenses connected with Sudanese and other expeditions.

"It is no new thing," said the Swâmi composedly, "that India should send forth missionaries. She used to do so under the Emperor Asoka, in days when the Buddhist faith was younger, when she had something to teach surrounding nations."

"Well, might one ask why she ever ceased doing so, and why she has now begun again?"

"She ceased because she grew selfish, forgot the principle that nations and individuals alike subsist and prosper by a system of give and take. Her mission to the world has always been the same. It is spiritual, the realm of introspective thought has been hers through all the ages, abstract science, metaphysics, logic, are her special domain. In reality my mission to England is an outcome of England's to India. It has been hers to conquer, to govern, to use her knowledge of physical science to her advantage and ours. In trying to sum up India's contribution to the world, I am reminded of a Sanskrit and an English idiom. When you say a man dies, your phrase is 'He gave up the ghost,' whereas we say, 'He gave up the body.' Similarly, you more than imply that the body is the chief part of man by saying it possesses a soul. Whereas we say a man is a soul and possesses a body. These are but small ripples on the surface, yet they show the current of your national thought. I should like to remind you how Schopenhauer predicted that the influence of Indian philosophy upon Europe would be as momentous when it became well known, as was the revival of Greek and Latin learning at the close of the Dark Ages. Oriental research is making great progress; a new world of ideas is opening to the seeker after truth."

"And is India finally to conquer her conquerors?"

"Yes, in the world of ideas. England has the sword, the material world, as our Muhammadan conquerors had before her. Yet Akbar the Great became practically a Hindu; educated Muhammadans, the Sufis, are hardly to be distinguished from Hindus; they do not eat cow, and in other ways conform to our usage. Their thought has become permeated by ours."

"So that is the fate you foresee for the lordly sahib? Just at this moment he seems to be a long way off it."

"No, it is not so remote as you imply. In the world of religious ideas the Hindu and the Englishman have much in common, and there is proof of the same thing among other religious communities. Where the English ruler or civil servant has had any knowledge of India's literature, especially her philosophy, there exists the ground of a common sympathy, a territory constantly widening. It is not too much to say that only ignorance is the cause of that exclusive—sometimes even contemptuous—attitude assumed by some."

"Yes, it is the measure of folly. Will you say why you went to America rather than to England on your mission?"

"That was a mere accident—a result of the World's Parliament of Religions being held in Chicago at the time of the World's Fair, instead of in London, as it ought to have been. The Rájá of Mysore and some other friends sent me to America as the Hindu representative. I stayed there three years, with the exception of last summer and this summer, when I came to lecture in London. The Americans are a great people, with a great future before them. I admire them very much, and found many kind friends among them. They are less prejudiced than the English, more ready to weigh and examine a new idea, to value it in spite of newness. They are most hospitable too; far less time is lost in showing one's credentials, as it were. You travel in America, as I did, from city to city, always lecturing among friends. I saw Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Desmoines, Memphis, and numbers of other places."

"And leaving disciples in each of them?"

"Yes, disciples, but not organisations. That is no part of my work. Of these there are enough in all conscience. Organisations need men to manage them; they must seek power, money, influence. Often they struggle for domination, and even fight."

"Could the gist of this mission of yours be summed up in a few words? Is it comparative religion you want to teach?"

"It is really the philosophy of religion, the kernel of all its outward forms. All forms of religion have

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

an essential and a non-essential part. If we strip from them the latter, there remains the real basis of all religion, which all forms of religion possess in common. Unity is behind them all. We may call it God, Allah, Jahvé, the Spirit, Love, it is the same unity that animates all life, from its lowest form to its noblest manifestation in man. It is on this unity we need to lay stress, whereas in the west, and indeed everywhere, it is on the non-essential that men are apt to lay stress. They will fight and kill each other for these forms, to make their fellows conform. Seeing that the essential is love of God and love of man, this is curious, to say the least."

"I suppose a Hindu could never persecute."

"He never yet has done so: he is the most tolerant of all the races of men. Considering how profoundly religious he is, one might have thought that he would persecute those who believe in no God. The Jains regard such belief as sheer delusion; yet no Jain has ever been persecuted. In India the Muhammadans were the first who ever took the sword."

"What progress does the doctrine of essential unity make in England? Here we have a thousand sects."

"They must gradually disappear as liberty and knowledge increase. They are founded on the non-essential, which by the nature of things cannot survive. The sects have served their purpose, which was that of an exclusive brotherhood on lines comprehended by those within it. Gradually we reach the idea of universal brotherhood by flinging down the walls of partition which separate such aggregations of individuals. In England the work proceeds slowly, possibly because the time is not more than ripe for it; but all the same, it makes progress. Let me call your attention to the similar work that England is engaged upon in India. Modern caste distinction is a barrier to India's progress. It narrows, restricts, separates. It will crumble before the advance of ideas.

"Yet some Englishmen, and they are not the least sympathetic to India, nor the most ignorant of her history, regard caste as in the main beneficent. One may easily be too much europeanised. You yourself condemn many of our ideals as materialistic."

"True. No reasonable person aims at assimilating India to England; the body is made by the thought that lies behind it. The body politic is thus the expression of national thought, and in India of thousands of years of thought. To europeanise India is therefore an impossible and foolish task: the elements of progress were always actively present in India. As soon as a peaceful government was there, these have always shown themselves. From the time of the Upanishads down to the present day nearly all our great teachers have wanted to break through the barriers of caste, *i.e.*, caste in its degenerate state, not the original system. What little good you see in the present caste clings to it from the original caste, which was the most glorious social institution. Budha tried to re-establish caste in its original form. At every period of India's awakening, there have always been great efforts made to break down caste. But it must always be *we* who build up a new India as an effect and continuation of her past, assimilating helpful foreign ideas wherever they may be found. Never can it be *they*; growth must proceed from within. All that England can do is to help India to work out her own salvation. All progress at the dictation of another, whose hand is at India's throat, is valueless, in my opinion. The highest work can only degenerate when slave-labour produces it."

"Have you given any attention to the Indian National Congress movement?"

"I cannot claim to have given much; my work is in another part of the field. But I regard the movement as significant, and heartily wish it success. A nation is being made out of India's different races. I sometimes think they are no less various than the different peoples of Europe. In the past, Europe has struggled for India's trade, a trade which has played a tremendous part in the civilisation of the world; its acquisition might almost be called a turning-point in the history of humanity. We see the Dutch, Portuguese, French, and English contending for it in succession. The discovery of America may be traced to the indemnification the Venetians sought in the far distant West for the loss they suffered in the East."

"Where will it end?"

"It will certainly end in the working out of India's homogeneity, in her acquiring what we may call democratic ideas. Intelligence must not remain the monopoly of the cultured few; it will be disseminated from higher to lower classes. Education is coming, and compulsory education will follow. The immense power of our people for work must be utilised. India's potentialities are great, and will be called forth."

"Has any nation ever been great without being a great military power?"

"Yes," said the Swâmi without a moment's hesitation. "China has. Amongst other countries, I have travelled in China and Japan. To-day China is like a disorganised mob; but in the heyday of her greatness she possessed the most admirable organisation any nation has yet known. Many of the devices and methods we term modern were practised by the Chinese for hundreds and even thousands of years. Take competitive examinations as an illustration."

"Why did she become disorganised?"

"Because she could not produce men equal to the system. You have the saying that men cannot be made virtuous by Act of Parliament; the Chinese experienced it before you. And that is why religion is of deeper importance than politics, since it goes to the root, and deals with the essentials of conduct."

"Is India conscious of the awakening that you allude to?"

"Perfectly conscious. The world perhaps sees it chiefly in the Congress movement and in the field of social reform; but the awakening is quite as real in religion, though it works more silently."

"The West and East have such different ideals of life. Ours seems to be the perfecting of the social state. Whilst we are busy seeing to these matters, Orientals are meditating on abstractions. Here has Parliament been discussing the payment of the Indian army in the Sudan. All the respectable

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

section of the Conservative press has made a loud outcry against the unjust decision of the Government, whereas you probably think the whole affair not worthy attention."

"But you are quite wrong," said the Swâmi, taking the paper and running his eye over extracts from the Conservative journals. "My sympathies in this matter are naturally with my country. Yet it reminds one of the old Sanskrit proverb: 'You have sold the elephant, why quarrel over the goad?' India always pays. The quarrels of politicians are very curious. It will take ages to bring religion into politics."

"One ought to make the effort very soon all the same."

"Yes, it is worth one's while to plant an idea in the heart of this great London, surely the greatest governing machine that has ever been set in motion. I often watch it working, the power and perfection with which the minutest vein is reached, its wonderful system of circulation and distribution. It helps one to realize how great is the Empire, and how great its task. And with all the rest, it distributes thought. It would be worth a man's while to place some ideas in the heart of this great machine so that they might circulate to the remotest part.

The Swâmi is a man of distinguished appearance. Tall, broad, with fine features enhanced by his picturesque Eastern dress, his personality is very striking. Swâmi is a title meaning master; Vivekânanda is an assumed name implying the bliss of discrimination. By birth, he is a Bengali, and by education, a graduate of Calcutta University. The Swâmi has taken the vow of Sanyasa, renunciation of all property, position, and name. His gifts as an orator are high. He can speak for an hour and a-half without a note, or the slightest pause for a word. Towards the end of September his lectures at St. George's Road will be resumed for a few weeks before his departure for Calcutta.

C. S. B.

K. S. RANJITSINHJI.

(BY AN EXPERT IN CRICKET.)

At a time when the ends of the earth are "together joined in cricket's manly toil," and the mother of the sport is contending with the child that is now her equal, it is a curious coincidence that a Hindu born and bred should incontestably surpass, as a batsman, all his colleagues in an England eleven. There were no few heartburnings when, amongst the English team chosen to meet the Australians at Lord's in the first test match, his name was not included, and no such explanation as that he is not of English birth proved in any way satisfactory to his countless admirers. But when his election for the second trial at Manchester resulted in the greatest achievement of the year's cricket, no Englishman was as popular among his compatriots as K. S. Ranjitsinhji. It must be said that his cricket is made in England. Though there were English masters who played cricket at the Rajkumar College, the play was not of a high order. It was not until he was nearly twenty years old that he had an opportunity of playing really good cricket. So that he is even now not much more than three years of age as a cricketer.

In the summer of 1892, having arrived in England with the view of pursuing his studies at Cambridge University, he resumed his boyish acquaintance with the summer sport, and on a memorable occasion for English cricket he was asked to fill a casual vacancy in the eleven of his college (Trinity). From that day his attainment of the first rank of exponents of the game was assured. He at once obtained his college colours, and in the spring of the following year was included in the team which met Oxford. His skill was so marked that he was able to choose his county, and at once set about qualifying himself to represent Sussex—a chivalrous choice, inasmuch as that county was in very low water at the time. As he had not been born in England, a two years' residential qualification was necessary, and he went to Brighton in 1893 chiefly with the view of assisting Sussex when qualified. He appeared for that county last year.

His performances as a Cambridge "blue" were, indeed, disappointing, for he scored no more than 9 runs in his two innings. But in the year's cricket for his University he stood third on the batting list with an average of the veriest trifle under 30 runs, though his highest single innings was 58, thus demonstrating in his first season that which has been his most valuable characteristic, his consistency. In 1894 he was unable to play for the University, except in one match when he made 41 for once out, and in that year he played but sixteen innings in first class cricket and stood eighth on the list of batsmen.

Early last season he was recognised as one of the three men between whom the honour of the greatest aggregates of runs during the year would be likely to be shared. He played but 39 innings against the 48 of W. G. Grace and the 50 of Abel. Had he equalled their numbers of attempts he might have surpassed their scores, for he improved as the season waned. As it was he barely escaped an average of 50, and, everything being taken into consideration, it may probably be said that the champion only was his superior as a batsman. Among his most brilliant double performances for Sussex were 95 and 57 against Somerset, 38 and not out 137 against Oxford, 59 and 74 against Yorkshire, 83 and 41 against Hampshire, 51 and not out 53 against Kent. He did not play in North *v.* South, Gentlemen *v.* Players, or Rest of England *v.* Stoddart's team.

His exploits this year are fresh in every one's memory. At the end of the great match at Manchester his total of runs for the season was within 100 of those he scored throughout last year's play, and he had made 250 in excess of the champion, who had played three innings more than the Prince. His average was exactly 61, and he held a good lead of the popular Surrey professional Abel, with whom for a long time he had been practically level. At present, therefore, he bids fair to carry off the honours of first place in total score and in the averages from all the home-born cricketers of the country.

Though it is impossible within the limits of one article to refer in detail to all the great innings he has played this year, space must be found for an

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

account of his greatest achievement, his display at Manchester. It was great in itself, greater in its occasion, and greatest in the adverse circumstances under which it was accomplished. At any time to score 216 runs for once out is a great feat, to score them against the best bowling of a nation is greater, and to score them amidst a succession of more or less pitiable failures on the part of other batsmen is greatest of all. Australia had put together a grand score, one which England might hope to rival but not greatly to surpass, and the two men whose records against Australian bowling were greatest went for 17 runs. Yet Ranjitsinhji played as if victory were secure, and, with but one worthy supporter, displayed fearless cricket when all his partners manifested concern if not alarm. He was out at last to a beautiful catch low down at point which would more often be missed than not. And England had to follow on 181 runs behind. Then was the Indian's opportunity in England's extremity. Three hundred runs save one came from the bat, and of these he was responsible for 154, and was not out at the close. In fact, could anyone have been found to stay with him, he would in all probability have been at the wicket at the end of the day. Nothing that could be tried had the least effect upon him. All sorts and conditions of balls he treated with the same masterly and watchful ability. All the traps which the wiliness of Giffen, Trott and McKibbin could lay were in vain spread in his sight, and every ball which offered a chance of runs was promptly despatched in the proper direction. With Trumble's straighter and better pitched deliveries he was more careful. It was a great exhibition of the art and science of batting, and one which for long may remain unequalled.

There are some natural advantages which Ranjitsinhji does not possess. He is not tall, he is not particularly strongly built. Most of our best batsmen who are not of great stature, are sturdily framed. But the Prince is neither of the mastiff nor of the bulldog type. He is a typical Oriental in physical appearance and has all the agility and rapidity of movement which are associated with the Asiatic in action. To look at his face and form when he is in the pavilion, and then when he is batting or fielding, one would hardly imagine that the two were the same man. It is the difference between the tiger at rest and the tiger in pursuit. His style may fairly be described as the cricket poetry of motion. Some of his strokes are simply marvellous; they are as swift, as subtle, and as certain as the rapid yet measured movements of an Indian juggler. He knows, one would say instinctively, if one did not feel that it must be due to the peculiar sensibility of his sight, just where the ball will be at a given instant, and his arms and his eyes are in perfect unison. He plays later at the ball than do most English batsmen, and no doubt he can afford to allow the break to take effect on a ball, before attempting to play it, with comparative safety. To see him stand unmoved as a ball passes within an inch or two of his body is amazing, but to watch the stroke with which he puts a ball head-high to leg over his shoulder, borders upon the uncanny; no one else would think of doing more than defending his head. Then his half-glance, half-push stroke to the on side of the wicket, when does it fail, and where can a more effective hit be found? Not even in the beautiful cut something in front of point, nor in the swift and low late cut through the slips, which he makes with such a graceful movement of the sinuous arms and supple wrists. Nor must it be thought that Ranjitsinhji is deficient in power, while grace is his special attribute. Those who have seen his straight drive when a fast bowler sends him a slightly over-pitched ball, have long ago recognised that his muscles must be as steel bands, as the ball with one leap recoils from the boundary.

Apart from his batting, K. S. Ranjitsinhji is a most useful man in the field. He usually takes third man or slip, and there brings off some marvellous catches. He gives a splendid example to the dilettante fieldsman, and is a fine judge of the speed of a ball and the possibility of arresting its progress before it reaches the boundary. He has bowled, but it is to be hoped that he will not run the risk of injuring his fine skill as a batsman by endeavouring to help his county as a bowler. He is not yet twenty-four years of age, so that there is plenty of time, if there is but little room, for improvement in his cricket.

Last year W. L. Murdoch, one of the greatest batsmen who ever lived, and one of the greatest authorities on cricket, recognised in Ranjitsinhji the most reliable and the best bat in England. To this high eulogy the only remark that need now be added is that he is this year also one of the most brilliant, dashing, and unassuming of batsmen. A sprained knee has caused him to relinquish football, but he is an adept at all other sports requiring a keen eye and steady nerves, and at rackets, tennis, shooting, etc., there are few who can beat him. The fact that he is an Indian is perhaps a happy augury for the relations between England and India, and it should, at any rate, be satisfactory to the inhabitants of his own fatherland that a native-born Rajput has worthily and well established himself in England as the popular hero of the times.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

It may be of interest to analyse the division list on Mr. Morley's amendment to Lord G. Hamilton's motion of July 6th, authorising a charge upon the Indian revenues for the ordinary expenses of the Indian force despatched to Suakin. Some eighty-three members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee (including one teller, Mr. Buchanan) took part in the division, all of them voting for Mr. Morley's amendment. The chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee—namely, Sir W. Wedderburn—also spoke in support of the amendment.

Twenty-three "Unionist" members (including one teller Mr. Maclean) voted for Mr. Morley's amendment. Their names are as follows:—Sir J. P. Dickson-Poynder, Sir H. S. King, Sir Lewis M'Iver, Sir A. Scoble, Hon. A. de Tatton Egerton, Hon. Vicary Gibbs; and Messrs. J. G. A. Baird, F. G. Banbury, G. C. T. Bartley, E. W. Beckett,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

M. M. Bhownaggree, T. Gibson Bowles, C. W. R. Cooke, F. W. Fison, H. S. Foster, Lawrence Hardy, Henniker Heaton, E. H. Hulse, J. Kenyon, J. Maclean, E. R. P. Moon, W. Morrison, and J. Parker Smith.

The following four "Unionist" members also voted against Lord G. Hamilton's resolution in the second division:—Sir H. S. King, Hon. Vicary Gibbs, Messrs. F. W. Fison, and J. Kenyon. In this division, taken under circumstances which are described elsewhere, the voting was much smaller than in the first division, and although the Government's majority was considerably larger than in the first division, the numbers of its supporters was less—namely, 252 as against 275. No "Unionist" member who voted for Mr. Morley's amendment voted in the second division in favour of Lord G. Hamilton's resolution.

There were 110 "Unionist" members absent from the first division. There were 36 Liberals (20 of whom were members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee) absent. There were 54 members of the Parnellite and Anti-Parnellite parties absent. Had these latter been present and voted for the amendment, the Government's majority would have been reduced to 31.

We append a tabular statement with regard to the voting on Mr. Morley's amendment:—

There voted against the amendment		275	
,, for the amendment		190	
			465
Add Tellers		4	
,, The Speaker		1	5
			470
Absentees.	Unionists	110	
,,	Liberals.....	36	
,,	Irish Members.....	54	200
	Full House....		670

Mr. John Morley's speech in the House of Commons on July 6th was not entirely a success. He had accumulated a large amount of material on the subject, but the superabundance of it seemed rather to embarrass than to help him. The result was that his speech contrasted not very favourably with the earlier speech which he had delivered at Leeds. It is by no means an uncommon thing for a speech in the House of Commons to fail through excessive quantity of matter. Moreover, Mr. John Morley on the platform is, as everybody knows, a rather different person from Mr. John Morley in the House of Commons. On the platform he often "lets himself go," and stirs the emotions, besides informing the minds, of his hearers. But in the House of Commons he is a much more critical, more tentative, more self-conscious speaker. His mind seems to be fixed, as his eye undoubtedly is, on the Treasury Bench, and he seems to be asking himself at the end of every sentence how it struck the members of the Cabinet, and what sort of answer they are formulating in their minds. He proceeds to demolish, or at any rate to discuss, this imaginary answer, and the result is discursiveness, and a certain lack of incisiveness and grip. The circumstance is greatly to be regretted as few men in the House of Commons, and no other magnates of the Front Bench, are so keen or so well informed as Mr. Morley on this particular question. He has the faculty, denied to some of his colleagues, of importing a certain moral earnestness into his logical duels.

Sir Henry Fowler, who has a really wonderful fluency when he is on the winning side, made a vigorous speech at a later stage in the debate. Those who heard it said, however, that it was addressed a little too obviously to the gallery, and that his spontaneous philanthropy might have been more convincing if he had not previously reduced his swelling periods to writing.

Before and during the debate on the Indian troops the complaints of Conservative members in the lobby of the House of Commons were characteristic and instructive. Lord G. Hamilton and his colleagues urged in self-defence that their transgression was "only a little one." Curiously enough, this very fact appeared to be the chief ground of complaint among their supporters. "What is so amazing to me," said one of them, and the remark really described the attitude of the majority, "is that the Government should have deliberately provoked such a storm for a paltry £35,000." In other words, the general feeling on the Ministerialist benches was that the offence would have been more respectable if it had been on a larger scale. The doctrine may not accord with the principles of an austere morality, but it found a place in the editorial columns of the *Times*.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was not in a position to express his opinion on the question in the House of Commons, especially as we happen to know that, in Mr. Naoroji's judgment, the fundamental point was equally ignored by both sides. India, Mr. Naoroji contends, has really no Imperial citizenship, and therefore the debates proceeded upon a false assumption. We find the idea of Imperial citizenship associated with India only when it is a question of bearing burdens. We hear nothing of it when it is a question of exercising rights. India, according to Mr. Naoroji, has been reduced to a mere community of helots, who have no effective voice in the management of their affairs.

We print elsewhere an article from a sporting correspondent on Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji's brilliant performances in the cricket field. Those who know the position which cricket now holds in the mind of the average British citizen will not be disposed to under-rate the services which Mr. Ranjitsinhji's bat has rendered to his country's cause. We may add that on July 27th he held the second place in the "first-class averages." In 34 innings he had scored 1,712 runs. His "most in an innings" was 171 "not out," he had been "not out" 4 times, and his "average" was 57·2. The only batsman whose average was better than his was Captain E. G. Wynyard. But Captain Wynyard had played only 14 innings, and his aggregate number of runs was 770. The experts agreed in saying that Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji was "still easily first among those who had played any large number of innings." A Manchester critic, describing Mr. Ranjitsinhji's brilliant stand against the Australians, said that the en-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

thusiasm of the Lancashire crowd was such that, even if he had asked for the re-imposition of the cotton duties in their original form, he would not have been denied.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

On Wednesday, July 15th, the Royal Commission appointed a year ago to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India and the apportionment of the charge between the Imperial Government and that country resumed its sittings at the India Office. The Commission have held 25 private sittings. The Commission consists of Lord Welby (chairman), Mr. L. Courtney, M.P., Mr. W. T. Jackson, M.P., Sir Donald Stewart, Bart., Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir R. H. Knox, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Mowbray, and Mr. Colin Campbell (secretary).

Sir R. KNOX, Accountant General of the Army, was the first witness examined. Replying to the Chairman with reference to the charge made against the Government of India on account of the British troops serving in that country, witness said the actual cost to the Exchequer of the maintenance of the British force in India consisted of every expense incurred at home which would not be incurred if it was not necessary to send the reliefs and the drafts to India. Seven pounds ten shillings was the calculated charge for training the individual soldier, recoverable from India, according to the service to which he belonged; the charge for non-commissioned officers who trained him, the waste in the form of those who deserted or died in the first year's service, the charge for young officers appointed to Indian regiments as vacancies occurred in regiments awaiting orders to be dispatched to India, and a charge for an educational establishment, where the officers underwent a certain amount of elementary education and training. Then there were charges for hospitals, &c. The total cost of these services had been calculated at £670,000 for one year, but it varied in different years. Thirty pounds was the average cost for each recruit sent out to India. That £30 included a considerable number of charges which were outside the capitation rate. The capitation grant of the British force in India had varied, at one time being £8 and at another time £10. The Indian military establishment for 1895-96 was 73,125 on which the charge of £7 10s. ahead was £548,437, exclusive of deferred pay.

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI: But it is not necessary to have such a large force in India. We Indians do not want it. The Indian army is quite sufficient to meet any contingency; but it is to maintain the British rule, both against Russia and the Indians.—Witness: The War Office look to supplying the demands of the Indian Government.

Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI: But that is really the British Government.

The witness further said the justice of continuing the charge of £7 10s. per soldier recoverable from India would partly depend on the strength of the Indian establishment remaining the same for the numbers sent to India in the year not materially varying. By the short-service system a larger number of soldiers had to be enlisted, but still the charges to India compared favourably with the old system in previous years. On the other hand, India got the benefit of many British services for which no charge was made to India.

The Commission adjourned.

On Wednesday, July 22nd, the Royal Commission to enquire into the administration and management of the expenditure of India, and into the apportionment of charge between India and the United Kingdom, sat at the India office, Lord Welby presiding. Sir R. Knox, Accountant General of the Army, was further examined. Asked what he had to say to the argument of the Indian Government that they were not consulted when the War Office made changes in its organization which affected India, witness replied that it had always been the desire of the War Office to consult the Indian Office, but it was very difficult to see how, except in small matters, India could avoid accepting their proposals, and the Indian Government recognised that. Sir Donald Stewart.—But there are some very heavy charges imposed upon the Government of India by a change in the organization of the Army which has nothing to do with the efficiency of the service? Witness.—No doubt there are changes in the organization of the Army the necessity of which the Indian Government may not see very distinctly. The Commission adjourned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1896.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "The Indian Imperial Service Troops."

COUNTRY HOUSE. "Sport in the Rewah Hills, India."

TO-MORROW. "M. M. Bhownaggree."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Acworth, H. A., "Reminiscences of Western India." Lasia, "A Novel in a Nutshell." "Indian Gentlemen in the West." "List of Indian Ladies in the West."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1896.

ECKENSTEIN, OSCAR....."The Karakorams and Kashmir." (Fisher Unwin)	6s. 0d.
SANJANA, DARAB DASTUR PESHOTAN, B.A....."The Zand I Javît Shêda Dad: or the Puhluvi version of the Avesta Vendidad, the text prescribed for the B.A. and M.A. examinations of the University of Bombay." (Education Society's Steam Press, Bombay)	— —
BARRY, J. P....."The War of the League." (*Times of India*, Bombay) ..	— —
DEVELIN, SERGEANT-MAJOR, R. E. ....."Views in Chitral." (Maclure and Co.)	30s. 0d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

[166.]	EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT)—Return of the Indian Financial Statement for 1896-97, and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon....	1s. 2½d.
[179.]	EAST INDIA (ESTIMATE)—Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1895-96, compared with the results of 1894-95.....	0s. 2d.
[180.]	EAST INDIA (HOME ACCOUNTS)—Home Accounts of the Government of India, 1894-95 and 1895-96	0s. 6d.
[218.]	EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITIONS)—Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1894-95. Thirty-first number	1s. 9d.
[229.]	EAST INDIA (INDIAN TARIFF ACT AND THE COTTON DUTIES)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council, with reference to the Despatch of 2nd April, 1896, to the Government of India	0s. 1½d.
[236.]	EAST INDIA (EXPENSES OF TROOPS DESPATCHED TO AFRICA IN AID OF EGYPTIAN TROOPS)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council	0s. 0½d.
[245.]	EAST INDIA (MAHARAJA RANA OF JHALAWAR) Copy of Correspondence Relating to the Deposition of the Maharaj Rana of Jhalawar..	1s. 5½d.

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[8,131.]	EAST INDIA (SUAKIN EXPEDITION)—Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State in Council, regarding the incidence of the cost of Indian troops when employed out of India	0s. 3½d.

LIST OF MARINE RECORDS OF THE LATE EAST INDIA COMPANY, and of subsequent date, preserved in the Record Department of the India Office, London. Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode — —

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, AUGUST, 1896.

"A MASTERPIECE OF MELANCHOLY MEANNESS."

There is a happy phrase of Aristotle's to describe a hopeless bit of special pleading—namely, an argument which no man would adopt "unless he were "defending a position." Few candid readers of the debates in both Houses of Parliament, and the Parliamentary papers, on the payment of the Indian troops despatched to Suakin will deny that the arguments adopted by Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues by way of apology for their policy are, from first to last, arguments of this kind. Ministers were "defending a position." In other words, it was not cogent reasons of an admissible type that induced them to formulate their policy; it was the policy upon which they had determined that compelled them afterwards to search for plausible reasons. Yet the reasons which they were ultimately able to produce did not appear plausible even to their own most loyal supporters. The Ministerialist press, with a few unimportant exceptions, agreed in denouncing in good set terms the injustice and the meanness of the Government's policy, while in the House of Commons the Government's majority fell from 147 to 85, although most of the Irish members, whose votes would have still further reduced the majority, were absent. Lord George Hamilton's speech in defence of his Resolution was, of course, merely an amplification of his despatch of June 30th—eked out with a little irrelevant and strangely misdirected invective to raise a party cheer. One of the many difficulties of his position arose from the fact that, having demolished in the case of Mombasa a claim described by its authors, the Treasury, as stronger than the claim put forward in 1885, he persuaded himself three months afterwards that "the precedent of 1885 was applicable to the "cost of the expedition to Suakin." Then, having telegraphed this amazing decision to the Viceroy on May 15th, he actually wrote in his despatch of June 30th: "it is impossible to say that the "decisions which have been arrived at on previous "occasions are such that any very clear or definite "doctrine can be drawn from them." This tangle of inconsistencies was bad enough. But the explanation or apology finally selected by Lord George Hamilton was even worse. He imagined that he cut the Gordian knot by asserting that, while one of the numerous official theories of the objects of the operations in the Sudan made mention of the maintenance and development of orderly and settled government in Egypt, the Government of India had no greater interest than the maintenance of rapid and secure transit between India and the United Kingdom. Mr. John Morley, whose respect for the meaning of words is acknowledged by all, described this paragraph, and described it truly, as the most spurious and insincere paragraph ever printed in any despatch from any department. Mr. Morley put the really fatal question when he asked at what stage in the transactions the relevancy of this precious argument had occurred to the Government. Had any danger to rapid and secure transit between India and the United Kingdom arisen from the fact that during the past decade Khartum had not been in the possession of Egypt? In all the recent talk of Ministerialists about the necessity of re-conquering the Sudan for Egypt was there so much as a syllable to suggest that India was concerned? In short, was not India ignored in the discussion altogether until it became desirable, in the judgment of the Cabinet, to borrow Indian troops and to charge India with their ordinary expenses? The questions have only to be asked. They answer themselves. India, as Sir Donald Stewart observes in his admirable Minute, has come into the matter accidentally, because the forces of Egypt did not suffice both to take the field and to hold Suakin, and because Suakin is not blessed with a good climate. The attempt to set up a direct Indian interest in the operations is an ungenerous and, we must add, a not very honest afterthought on the part of men who, on

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

other grounds, had already decided that India should lend troops and nevertheless continue to pay them. That is what justifies the use of the striking, although alliterative, phrase coined by Mr. Fawcett when India was charged with the cost of the ball given in honour of the Sultan of Turkey. The policy of the Government is "a masterpiece of "melancholy meanness."

Not only do Lord George Hamilton's arguments in reply to the Treasury in the case of Mombasa stultify his compliance in the case of Suakin, but the various parts of his despatch of June 30th are inconsistent with each other. He expressly calls Lord Elgin's attention to the fact that he has throughout dwelt upon the temporary nature of the payment as an "essential condition of the "arrangement" agreed upon. That is to say, if the Indian troops remain at Suakin after December 31st next, the question of payment will come up for reconsideration. But if the claim of the Treasury is good until December 31st, how does it then become bad? Is the interest of India in the "main- "tenance and development of orderly and settled "government in Egypt" to terminate at midnight, precisely, on December 31st, 1896? Or is it merely that the Treasury will then acknowledge that the security of the Suez Canal is one thing, and the present war of "limited liability" in the Sudan another? Lord G. Hamilton only shows his appreciation of the weakness of his case when he is at such pains to argue that the borrowed force is small and the payment strictly temporary. Lord Onslow in the House of Lords, on July 16th, repeated Lord G. Hamilton's speech with almost ludicrous fidelity. But Lord Salisbury, with characteristic originality and no less characteristic indiscretion, produced a new and revised version of the Government's reasons. The object which the Government had in view in moving the Indian troops was, he said, solely the defence of Suakin. They were not to take any part in, and had nothing to do with, the Sudan expedition. Suakin had to be defended at the expense of the Indian taxpayer or of the British taxpayer, and the Government had decided that the duty properly belonged to India on the ground of superior interest in the southern littoral of the Red Sea. If this be the authorised version of the Government's policy, what becomes of Lord G. Hamilton's despatch of June 30th, which was based on the proposition that India had a direct interest in the Sudan expedition and had for that reason been required to contribute? Lord Salisbury's speech, of course, only showed for the twentieth time how utterly at a loss Ministers are to defend what they have done, and how ready they are, even at the cost of all appearance of consistency, to catch at any straw of afterthought which seems for the moment likely to help them. But Lord Salisbury's version is really as feeble as Lord George Hamilton's. If the duty of garrisoning Suakin belongs properly to India, and is not in any way connected with the Sudan expedition, then it is, to say the least, most unfortunate that the Government waited for the expedition to discover the duty. A coincidence of this kind would be open to an odious interpretation, even if we did not know, as we do, that the garrison at Suakin which the Indian troops replaced was wanted and was actually employed for the Sudan expedition, and would never have been withdrawn for that purpose if the loan of Indian troops had not been guaranteed. As for Lord Salisbury's general proposition that India is interested in a greater degree than England in the safety of the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, that is a large assumption which we need not discuss now, but which, we are very sure, any intelligent Indian would stoutly resist. Lord Salisbury's mode of proof, however, is as cynical as his statement that India is making no real contribution on the present occasion is grotesque. Aden, he says, is situated at the mouth of the Red Sea, and the defence of Aden is paid for entirely by the taxpayers of India. "This shows," the scrupulous dialectician concludes, "what an interest India has in the "southern littoral of the Red Sea." We respectfully submit that it shows nothing of the kind. What it shows is merely that a certain charge has been laid upon India by the British Government, and Lord Salisbury, who has been Secretary of State for India, knows, or ought to know, that the Government of India has for more than thirty years protested against the charge as unjust, and that the questions connected with it have now been referred to Lord Welby's Commission. If the proceedings of that Commission, and the valuable documents laid before it, had been, as they ought to have been, made public from the outset, the "melancholy meanness" of Lord Salisbury and his colleagues would have been more difficult, if not impossible.

Mr. Morley in the course of his comprehensive speech—it was, in fact, not so much a speech as a discursive review of almost superabundant material—asked what would be thought of him if he borrowed from Lord G. Hamilton a pair of carriage horses for an Egyptian friend, and, at the end of the summer, returned them with a bill for the cost of the hay, the straw, the shoeing, and the grooming. The apt illustration was received with laughter and cheers, but it really understated the case. For (1) the loan of Indian troops is virtually compulsory, (2) it is possible only because the size of the Indian army is regulated by the borrower, and (3) the loan is required not because the borrower is in need—there are British soldiers enough to garrison Suakin—but because Indian troops are able to stand a hot

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

climate. In other words, India pays a sort of penalty, instead of receiving some consideration, for the special fitness of her soldiers to do a piece of work in which she repudiates any interest. England, being strong, ought to be scrupulously fair, and even generous, in her dealings with India, which is weak, and has no votes in the House of Commons. We owe it, as Lord Rosebery well said, to our honour and our dignity to show a singular tenderness for the interests of India when we are judges, and judges in a case to which we are parties. But the humiliating truth is that, while we compel an unwilling contribution from India on occasions like the present, there is a marked absence of reciprocity when the position of the parties is reversed. In short, the history of our transactions in both capacities — as lenders and as borrowers — unpleasantly recalls Thrasymachus's definition of justice as "the interest of the stronger." Fortunately, there now seems good reason to hope that this particular type of meanness has been perpetrated for the last time. It behoves us, indeed, to be cautious in indulging in opinions about the future in view of the pious hopes expressed by Lord Cross and Mr. W. L. Jackson in 1887, and falsified, apparently with their authors' approval, in 1896. But it may, perhaps, be safely asserted, after the storm of indignation which the present injustice has excited, that no British Government is likely to repeat the offence. We confess that we have more faith in this wholesome fear of public opinion than in the saving grace of the so-called "principles" formulated by Lord George Hamilton in his despatch, and printed on another page. The first two "principles" merely register a commonplace in language somewhat too large for the occasion, while the third "principle" permits, and was obviously framed after the event to justify, the injustice which has now been committed. For the rest, Lord Salisbury's vague suggestion of a new and impartial tribunal to consider the relative interests and rights of India and the United Kingdom is discussed elsewhere by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. Nothing could be better than to secure the equitable consideration of all such questions by a judicial tribunal. Nothing could be worse than to weaken the hold of the House of Commons upon Indian questions or to diminish its interest in them. It may perhaps be regarded by some as a rather sinister sign that Lord Salisbury referred to his proposal in a context of disparagement of Parliamentary discussion, and of regrets at the disclosure of departmental communications. He applied the epithet "squalid" to the discussion—not to the policy which rendered discussion necessary. But, whatever may be Lord Salisbury's motives, his proposal deserves to be considered on its merits, and Lord Welby and his colleagues will doubtless respond to the invitation for suggestions. At least three further results the policy of the Cabinet, and the recent discussion, ought to produce. They ought to stimulate the Indian demand for direct representation in Parliament. They ought to strengthen the protests against the maintenance of the British army in India at its present numerical strength. "If," said Lord Salisbury (then Lord Cranborne) in 1867, "if the garrison which we keep in India is necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, it ought not to be rashly diminished. If it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed." Finally, recent events ought to develope the interest, as they have illustrated the responsibility, of British citizens in Indian affairs. If this end be secured, the "masterpiece of melancholy meanness" will not, after all, have been wholly and solely deplorable.

NATURAL LAW IN THE POLITICAL WORLD.

In an age which expects to "run and read" at the same time—in which newspapers publish lists of "Authors of the Week" and "Books of the Day" with apparently unconscious satire—a curiously artificial process is adopted for keeping alive the memory of great men whom we feel we ought not to forget. We search our calendars, or rather let some enterprising editor do it for us, and Burns or Gibbon is presented as a fresh dish to our jaded literary appetites, the hero of a centenary hurriedly celebrated and quickly dismissed. It is not much, though it is better than nothing. In the meantime the author who died twenty or thirty years ago runs every risk of being unjustly forgotten. He has not been long enough in his grave to be disinterred for fresh obsequies, and though he may be remembered with some enthusiasm by a few elderly people, they are, of course, old fogeys who have not kept pace with the newer literature on the subject, and we attach little importance to their opinions. Such at least must be the view of those who feel the literary pulse of the nation through its press. One would fain believe, however, that the book of a quarter of a century ago is still alive and doing good work in many a quiet library and secluded study, read and pondered still sometimes by sober thinkers who make little noise in the newspapers. This hope derives some encouragement from the fact that new editions of "Physics and Politics" are still called for, though it was first published in the early seventies, and its author died in 1877. "It is," says Mr. R. H. Hutton in his memoir of Walter Bagehot, "a book in which I find new force and depth every

[1] "Physics and Politics: Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of 'Natural Selection' and 'Inheritance' to Political Society." By Walter Bagehot. New and cheaper edition. (London: Kegan Paul and Co.)

[1] "Social Rights and Duties: Addresses to Ethical Societies." By Leslie Stephen. 2 vols. (London: Swan Sonnenschein.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"time I take it up afresh." Those who care that a work of great intellectual force, of great literary charm, and possessing a rare power of stimulating thought in the reader, should have as long a life as possible, may rejoice that "Physics and Politics" is not buried underneath Mr. Kidd's "Social Evolu-" tion" or other more recent and ponderous tomes.

The title that Bagehot selected for his essay is a little obscure and misleading, for "Physics" generally stands for the one science to which the theory of evolution has not yet been applied. By "Physics" Bagehot meant "Nature," and the adaptation of Mr. Drummond's famous title which has been prefixed to this article describes his subject fairly enough. The sciences, especially the newer sciences, have made such vast strides since 1870 that it might have been expected that a work on sociology written so long ago would be of little scientific value now, whatever its literary interest might be. But the truth is that sociology, in spite of its fascination and of the results expected from it by its first enthusiastic professors, remains almost as much in its infancy now as then. Here is what Mr. Leslie Stephen, a sufficiently high authority, says in the interesting volume of studies that he published only the other day:

"What remains? There is, shall we say, no science of sociology—merely a heap of vague, empirical observations, too flimsy to be useful in strict logical inference. I should, I confess, be apt to say so myself. . . . . We have not the data necessary for obtaining anything like precise laws. A mathematician can tell you precisely what he means when he speaks of bodies moving under the influence of an attraction which varies inversely as the square of the distance. But what are the attractive forces which hold together the body politic? They are a number of human passions, which even the acutest psychologists are as yet quite unable to analyse or to classify: they act according to laws of which we have hardly the vaguest inkling; and, even if we possessed any definite laws, the facts to which they have to be applied are so amazingly complex as to defy any attempt at assigning results. There is, so far as I can see, no ground for supposing that there is or ever can be a body of precise truths at all capable of comparison with the exact sciences. ("Social Rights and Duties," vol. i, p. 53-54.)

Yet he adds immediately, "But this obvious truth, "though it implies very narrow limits to our hopes of "scientific results, does not force us to renounce the "application of scientific method. . . . . A change "of method and spirit is, in my opinion, of con-"siderable importance, and very vague results "would still imply an improvement in the chaos of "what now passes for political philosophy." Now Bagehot was peculiarly fitted to help towards this improvement in spirit and method, because he united in an eminent degree the qualities of the student and the practical man. Mr. Leslie Stephen has noted the contrast so often to be found in the shrewd man of business between his "keen vigorous good sense "upon immediate questions of the day" and "the "paltry little outworn platitudes which he introduces "when he wants to tag his arguments with sounding "principles." From that contrast Bagehot was saved by his philosophical studies, just as his knowledge of the world saved him from becoming a "mere "black beetle" of a student. In the paradoxical thesis of his first published letters—that the French are too clever a nation for free institutions, which are only suited to a slow-witted people like the British—it is easy to see the influence of his own practical experience of life in rural England and in the Paris of the *Coup d'Etat*. The stolid Conservatism of Somersetshire moved him to admiration quite genuine though largely mixed with humorous contempt, while the political mobility of the French alarmed as well as interested him. The teaching of ancient history seemed to him the same: the empire of quick-witted Athens, mother of arts and song, crumbling away in a few short years, while Rome, with far less intellectual ability, builds up an empire that endures for ages. The same thesis, only less paradoxically stated, underlay "Physics and Politics." The first great need of early man is law, no matter what. Nations which obtained a fixed law by processes of incredible difficulty soon destroyed those neighbours that did not. The first essential step towards civilisation is "the cementing "of the cake of custom." The next is "the break-"ing of the cake of custom." The cake may be broken too soon, or it may never be broken at all. In the latter case we get the phenomenon, so familiar in the East, of "arrested civilisation"; Athens is an instance of the former kind of failure. The main influence that breaks the yoke of custom is the introduction of discussion into government. Discussion, when it can be borne, is useful also as helping to retard action; the impulse to action, most valuable in uncivilised times, is inherited to a harmful extent by civilised man.

Such is a brief summary of the argument of "Physics and Politics." It can convey little idea of the brilliance and suggestiveness of the book. Pregnant sayings abound, of which the following are specimens: "The whole history of civilisation is "strewn with creeds and institutions which were "invaluable at first and deadly afterwards" (p. 74). "Dryden had a dream of an early age, 'when wild "'in woods the noble savage ran'; but 'when lone "'in woods the cringing savage crept,' would have "been more like all we know of that early, bare, "painful period" (p. 55). Or take the explanation of the strength of caste-nations in early times contrasted with their subsequent unprogressiveness: "The whole of a caste nation is more various than "the whole of a non-caste nation, but each caste "itself is more monotonous than anything is, or can "be, in a non-caste nation" (p. 149).

The idea of evolution is so attractive and so fruitful in its application to the history of the human race, and so certain to dominate the minds of students of political science, that it may be well to end this article with one caution in regard to it. Bagehot, we have seen, was impressed by the danger of excessive action, and therefore emphasised the need for deliberation. There is an opposite danger to which the student of sociology, impressed by the working of "natural law," is more likely to fall a victim. He may feel that it is useless to fight against "nature," and drift into a fatalistic attitude towards politics. Let him remember, therefore, that man, unlike other parts of nature, can consciously modify his environment, and that he forfeits his highest privilege and abandons his highest duty if he does not strive to modify it for the good of the coming generations.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

ORDINARY EXPENSES CHARGED ON INDIAN REVENUES.

I.—THE DEBATE IN THE COMMONS.

Our Parliamentary Correspondent writes:—The debate in the House of Commons on July 6th was marred by one or two secondary but important influences. The first was that an unexpected discussion on a private Bill opened up in front of it and delayed the commencement of the debate by nearly a couple of hours. As, despite this delay at the beginning, the debate still had to close at the usual time, it was cut short and practically a most important two hours and a half, and a dozen or more speeches, were cut out of the middle. The earlier part of the debate had not half run its course, nearly a score of members being on their feet attempting to obtain the right to speak, when Sir M. Hicks-Beach rose to begin the closing speeches. Thus a large number of supporters of the Government, who on this occasion were going to speak against their leaders, were silenced by an unavoidable accident and the moral effect of their action was entirely lost. But this was not the most important element. There is another which probably influenced the result profoundly. It is one of the curious results of the length of the sittings of the House of Commons that members go away for a couple of hours in the middle of the evening for dinner but the speech-making (it cannot then be called debate) is continued in their absence. The Speaker remains in the chair (except for a very brief interval,) the orator is on his legs, but he has no audience except one or two, and a-half a dozen other members who are waiting to get the chance of speaking when he sits down. The result is that although these speeches are delivered and appear in the newspapers, and have perhaps as much weight as others with the reading public, they are something entirely different from the earlier and the later speeches delivered to a large and attentive audience in the House and have little or no effect upon the minds of the absent members who, an hour or two later, will vote in the division lobby. Owing to the later commencement of the debate, and the great length of Lord G. Hamilton's and Mr. Morley's speeches, the "dinner hour" had arrived and the audience to a large extent disappeared before the important speeches of Mr. Maclean and those who followed him were delivered. The effect which these speeches would have had if they had been delivered an hour or two earlier was lost, and and the vast bulk of the members made up their minds on the subject from what they heard of Lord G. Hamilton and Mr. Morley at the beginning and Mr. Balfour at the end.

All this was very unfortunate, for seldom if ever was there an audience in the House of Commons more ready to be swayed one way or the other by the speeches delivered in debate. It was obvious that scores of members were uncertain how to vote, and they waited to see whether Lord G. Hamilton on one side, or Mr. Morley on the other, could make such a case as to leave their judgment decided. Members of the House of Commons, especially Lancashire Conservative members who owe their seats to the fight over the cotton duties, are just now peculiarly sensitive about Indian affairs. The agitation on behalf of justice to India has touched their consciences, or their instincts of self-preservation, and the revolt of nearly the whole Conservative press against the action of the Government had thoroughly awakened them to the danger of giving a blind, unheeding, party vote. Almost each man was prepared to think for himself. This made the situation almost unique. It was first apparent in the anxious air of attention with which the great audience settled down to listen to Lord G. Hamilton, and the chilling, critical silence in which he was allowed to proceed. His speech evidently did not satisfy his audience. There was a little relief in the mere party points, not particularly relevant to the issue before the House, which gave Conservative members an opportunity for cheers towards the end. But this left the real matter which was troubling their minds undecided. They were open to be swayed either way by something higher than dry quibbles about precedents, some appeal to high principle, to some emotional feeling of patriotism or generous loyalty to subject or kindred races. Lord George failed, and thus a great opportunity was left for Mr. Morley—one of those great opportunities which come so seldom to a man in the House of Commons. Party loyalty and all the small influences which control the voting in the House were relaxed. Opinion was in a fluid state, the votes of his party opponents were to be had by the exercise of some striking oratorical force which should sweep members into the lobby. But Mr. Morley did not rise to the occasion. He spoke for nearly an hour and a-half, he went down to the dull level of arguing about past transactions and old precedents, and dwelt on points which emphasised ordinary party divisions, keeping up and strengthening the partition which for once might have been thrown down. Slowly the audience slipped through his fingers. The tension on their party loyalty, which was almost a hunger for some good sound reason for voting against their leaders, was relaxed. They began to feel more comfortable in the thought that they might vote in obedience to the party whip after all, and then they found it was dinner time and that they might as well go and dine.

Mr. Maclean's declaration that if the matter had been left to the independent judgment of the House the Government would not have had many supporters was delivered when the truth had already half faded out of it. His speech—bright, able, forcible—did much to retrieve lost ground, but the audience whom it might have swayed had to a large extent already disappeared into the dining rooms. Then came Mr. V. Gibb's indignant protest, followed by Mr. Bhownaggree, who spoke to absolutely empty benches. Then, the "dinner hour" passing away and members slowly returning, there was a rush of a score of members, competing in their endeavours to speak. There was not a large audience to hear Sir A. Scoble's and Sir W. Wedderburn's serious warning against the far-reaching evil attending on the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

great injustice about to be perpetrated. Meanwhile the Whips were busy in the lobbies and elsewhere putting pressure on the unhappy members. They were threatened that if the Government were defeated there would be an immediate dissolution, and they would be plunged into a fight in the constituencies to retain their seats—a fight which would end many a Parliamentary career. The audience slowly gathered again, this time in a different mood from that in which they had listened to Lord George Hamilton five hours earlier. Sir M. Hicks-Beach took the field and made a much better speech than his colleagues, and then when Sir Henry Fowler's turn came to close the debate for the Opposition nearly all chance of really influencing a large section of the House had passed. He thundered in vain against the stone wall of restored party discipline. By the time Mr. Balfour rose his party was fairly compact and had made up its mind to vote with him. There was now once more the boisterous, irresponsible feeling of ordinary obedience in the air. The cheers, which could not have been evoked a few hours earlier, now came readily enough, and Mr. Balfour, fully understanding the crisis through which he had passed, and which was not yet entirely over, fought with passion and force which he seldom displays. All risk of defeat faded away. Doubting members were won back. Some who in the morning had determined to vote against their party were now ready to vote with it, and others changed their opposition into less dangerous abstention. The result was that when the opposing forces streamed into the lobbies it was but a comparatively small section of the friends of India in the Conservative ranks who were found ready to risk anything for the cause, and the Government defeated the amendment with a loss of only sixty votes.

Then came another unfortunate incident. When there is an amendment to be negatived and a resolution to be carried, the issue in each case being practically the same, the House seldom goes to the trouble and waste of time of two divisions. On this occasion, as usual, the first division was accepted as deciding the matter, and the moment it was over many members hurried away just in time to catch their last train home, without waiting to hear the original resolution formally adopted. But Sir Charles Dilke and one or two of his personal following challenged a division, and, despite the warning that some scores of Liberals had gone away beyond recall, persisted in it. Their irresponsible action put the Liberal leaders in a difficulty. The moral effect of the first division was likely to be weakened by one more favourable for the Government. The only chance for the opponents of the Government was to leave the House and so destroy the moral effect of the second division by reducing it to absurd proportions. This policy was hastily adopted, but was only partially successful. The ex-ministers and many of their followers hurried to the door. Some escaped. But the bulk were too late and were shut in. The mass of members voting was reduced by nearly a quarter—from 465 to 358. But of the smaller number a much larger proportion were supporters of the Government, and it fell out that by still one more of a series of unfortunate accidents the Government appeared to carry their Resolution, without the loss of a vote, by their normal party majority of 146.

II.—IN THE LORDS.

When the resolution came on July 16th to be confirmed by the House of Lords the spectacle differed materially from that which was presented by the debate in the Commons. The House of Lords is not given to excitement; the hereditary legislators have been left untouched by the new wave of awakened interest in Indian affairs; the Government have an overwhelming majority and so ran no risk of defeat. Under these circumstances the debate was a formality, or would have been if Lord Salisbury and Lord Lansdowne had not taken advantage of the opportunity to try to improve the case for the Government by such refinements and afterthoughts of argument as the previous debates had suggested. It was to these points of the debate that the large audience of visitors listened most attentively. The Strangers' Gallery was unusually crowded, the visitors being almost without exception evidently connected with India, British officials and ex-officials being closely mingled with Indians. The Siamese Princes were in a special Gallery and there were many peeresses in the side galleries who had come to hear their husbands speak. The House of Lords is a difficult audience to address, and an uninteresting one to watch, for, partly from lack of feeling, and partly from reserve, the members hardly ever make any demonstration of approval or disapproval or show in any way what effect the successive orators are having on their minds. They did, however, give a slight indication of impatience when Lord Onslow, who had to move the Resolution, and who is not an impressive speaker, prolonged his repetition of Lord G. Hamilton's arguments to an inordinate length. It was Lord Lansdowne who really made the strong speech in defence of the Resolution, and it was the more interesting to hear him defend the charge upon India because, only a short time ago, on his return from India, he made a powerful appeal to the House to be more just and considerate to the Indian taxpayer. Another interesting feature was the interposition of the venerable Duke of Argyll, whose connexion with the Government of India dates back to a period beyond the memory of the present generation of politicians. Lord Northbrook was the only Unionist peer who spoke against the Government. Lord Kimberley, before attacking the Government, had to justify his own action in 1885, and explain why he now felt at liberty to take a different line. It was a striking feature of this debate that so many of the principles and influences involved were personified in the men actually speaking. They were the men whose personal will had decided many of the issues. The Government of India and Lord Lansdowne, the India Office and Lord Kimberley, the Home Government and Lord Salisbury are, or have been, largely interchangeable terms. The House of Lords are accustomed to this, but they experienced a novel sensation when that peculiarly impersonal and powerful department, "the Treasury," appeared in the person of Lord Welby. For many years Lord

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Welby had, in the recesses of his office, held the purse-strings of the British Exchequer, and issued from thence those imperious demands or refusals to which all the governing departments bow. Lord Welby has but recently emerged from his den and taken a place as a member of the Legislature, and the Lords evidently felt there was a certain piquancy in having that dread abstraction "the Treasury" there in flesh and blood before them. This was increased by the fact that Lord Welby, in his unofficial capacity, is a political opponent of the present Government. Several references were made to his presence, Lord Salisbury in particular challenging him to explain the tenderness which he was about to show for the Indian tax-payer as contrasted with the soulless rigour "the Treasury" had always shown and is still showing. One item in Lord Salisbury's speech which was evidently the most unexpected was the revelation that he had proposed to his Cabinet to establish some tribunal of arbitration between the Indian and the Home Government, but had been overruled by his colleagues. Lord Rosebery concluded the debate with a brief but vigorous speech. In a few clear sentences he gave an uncompromising denial to the argument of the Government—sentences which pledged him to do full justice to India if he is ever again in power. About a hundred and thirty peers took part in the division. The forty who voted against the Government probably represented nearly the full number of the opponents of the resolution. The ninety-two who defeated them represented not only themselves but several hundreds of their colleagues, whom the Government can always rely on in an emergency.

III.—SUMMARY OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

In anticipation of the recent debates in both Houses of Parliament on the payment of Indian troops despatched to Suakin, two important Parliamentary papers were issued—one at the end of June, the other early in July.

The first was a Return (No. 236), moved for by Mr. John Morley, and dated India Office, June 16th, "of opinions and reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council, on the 16th day of May, under 21 and 22 Vict., c. 106, s. 23, with reference to the expenses of the troops to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops."

The second was a White-book [C.—8131] containing "Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State in Council, regarding the incidence of the cost of Indian troops when employed out of India."

We give below the substance of these documents.

"INDIA HAS COME INTO THE MATTER ACCIDENTALLY."
—Sir Donald Stewart and Sir James Peile.

The "Return of Opinions and Reasons" contained two Minutes—the first, which was opposed to the proposals of the Government, signed by Sir J. B. Peile and Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart; the second, which approved the proposals of the Government, signed by Sir Alexander Arbuthnot.

Sir James Peile's and Sir Donald Stewart's Minute is important enough to be cited *in extenso*. Amid all that has been written and said on the question we shall probably look in vain for a statement at once so concise, so moderate, and so conclusive:—

"We accept the principle that India may be expected to contribute to the cost of military operations outside India, if she can be shown to have a direct and substantial interest in such operations.

"Each case must be judged on its merits in the light of this principle.

"In the present case we do not find that India has a direct and substantial interest in the recovery of the Soudan by Egypt. The Egyptian Government and the Canal were not in any danger. The case simply is that, as the power of the Mahdi and the Dervishes appears to be breaking up, the moment was thought opportune for striking a vigorous blow.

"There was no question, when the operations were commenced, whether India was so directly and specially interested in them that she ought to be a partner with England (or is it not with Egypt?) in the cost. *India has come into the matter accidentally.* It was found that the forces of Egypt did not suffice both to take the field and to hold Suakin. *If Suakin had been blessed with a good climate, no doubt English regiments would have been sent there, and, if they had, it cannot be contended that India would have been required to contribute.* But its climate is more favourable to Orientals than to Europeans, and therefore the Government of India was asked to send troops, and it cheerfully complied by selecting some of its best.

"Then arose the subject of payment, and therewith reappeared the old doctrine that India should pay the ordinary cost of the troops lent. The argument addressed to India is: you would have had to pay if the troops had not been sent, so it makes no difference. *But surely there is a great difference between paying your own men for doing your own work in your own country, and paying the same men for doing other people's work in a foreign country.* The Treasury has urged against India that, if India does not pay the ordinary charges, there will be an actual saving in the Indian Budget. But is it unreasonable that India should make a saving by not paying for what she does not get? Such arguments are to be avoided, because they force attention to the contrast between what is required of India, and the way in which England deals with India, as regards the supply of troops. If England charges India for the entire cost of the recruit from the moment when he leaves England to join the garrison of India, why should India bear the cost of the soldiery it has trained when they leave India to join the garrison at Suakin?

"It is well, therefore, to leave arguments of this kind and to return to the only true criterion, viz., whether India has such a direct, special, and substantial interest in any military operations abroad that she may reasonably be required to join in providing the cost. We consider that no such interest has been shown in this case; and, when the interest of India is questionable and open to argument, it is sound policy in the English Government to incline to the more liberal view.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"We confine our dissent to the question of payment. We entirely approve the alacrity of the Government of India in supplying the troops, and would always approve of such action."

The Sarcasm of Sir A. Arbuthnot.

If anything were required to strengthen the position taken up by Sir Donald Stewart and Sir James Peile it would be supplied by Sir Alexander Arbuthnot's adverse Minute, which, with unconscious sarcasm, demolishes the case that it purports to approve. Sir Alexander writes, for example:—

"All that India is asked to do is to bear for a limited period the ordinary expenses of the Indian troops which are to be sent; all the additional charges which will be incurred being met from the British or the Egyptian treasury. The view of the majority of the Council is that it is not unreasonable, in an emergency of this nature, that India should go on paying *to the end of the present year, or for a shorter period* if the services of the Indian troops can be dispensed with at an earlier date, the ordinary charges which would have had to be met from the Indian treasury if the troops had been kept in India. *It is very generally agreed that this arrangement could not be continued for an indefinite or prolonged period*, although I consider that a good deal might be said against this view, if we are justified, as I think we are, in holding that India has a direct and substantial interest in the success of the present operations in the Sudan."

Exactly. If the arrangement temporarily proposed by the Cabinet were defensible at all, it would be defensible for a prolonged period. But, as it is, nobody pretends that the arrangement could be "continued for an indefinite or prolonged period." Its apologists fall back upon the traditional excuse for a lapse from virtue—that "it is only a little one." Sir A. Arbuthnot thus exposes, with a candour worthy of Sir John Gorst, the unreasonableness of his political associates. He adds that a specially strong point in Sir Donald Stewart's case is "the fact that the entire cost of the British troops supplied for the defence of India is defrayed from Indian revenues from the moment the troops leave England."

"This point raises the very large question of the relations between the British and Indian treasuries, and I venture to think that from this point of view there is much to be said in favour of the arrangement which my two colleagues denounce; for I cannot help hoping that the very reasonable attitude of the majority of the Council in this matter may tend to place those relations upon a better footing, and to induce some degree of reciprocity on the part of the British treasury, in the event of India in some future emergency having to apply to England for special military help."

In other words, there is at present no "degree of reciprocity on the part of the British Treasury," but Sir Alexander Arbuthnot hopes that, as India has been compelled to do something which she could not justly be required to do, the Treasury may behave less unfairly in future. Whether this hope is, or is not, too sanguine, we need not pause to enquire. But it supplies, to say the least, a curious ground for the contention that the present demand upon India is just. The richest passage in Sir A. Arbuthnot's Minute is, however, the last:—

"I will only add that on general grounds I regard the employment of Indian troops upon a duty of this nature as highly conducive to the interests of the Empire, as well from an Indian as from an Imperial point of view. Such an employment fosters that most valuable sentiment of solidarity between our British and our Indian troops, and it tends to raise our military prestige in the eyes of other nations."

Under all the circumstances this reference to the "valuable sentiment of solidarity" is, in its way, a triumph.

The History of the Loans.

We turn now to the White-book, containing the correspondence, and it may be convenient to preface our summary of it with a tabular statement showing the various occasions upon which England has borrowed troops from India.

Year.	Purpose.	Prime Minister.	Payment by India.
1859-60	China Expedition ...	Lord Palmerston ...	*Nil.*
1860-61	New Zealand	Lord Palmerston ...	Ordinary expenses
1867	Abyssinian Expedition	Lord Derby ...	Ordinary expenses
1875	Perak Expedition ...	Mr. Disraeli ...	Ordinary expenses
1878	Malta	Lord Beaconsfield	*Nil.*
1878	Afghan War	Lord Beaconsfield	Whole expenditure *less* 5 millions
1882	Egypt	Mr. Gladstone ...	Whole expenditure *less* £500,000
1885	Sudan Expedition ...	Mr. Gladstone ...	Ordinary expenses
1896 (Mar.)	Mombasa	Lord Salisbury ...	*Nil.*
1896 (May)	Suakin	Lord Salisbury ...	Ordinary expenses

The Recent White-book.

The White-book containing "Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State in Council" falls naturally into three parts, as follows:—

(i) Correspondence regarding the Sudan Expedition in 1885 (pp. 3-12);

(ii) Correspondence regarding Mombasa, 1896 (pp. 13-16);

(iii) Correspondence regarding the Sudan, 1896 (pp. 16-33).

And, whatever may have been the purpose with which the White-book was compiled in this way, the result is excellent. For, while the correspondence relating to 1885 concluded with some notable admissions on the part of the India Office and the Treasury, the correspondence relating to Mombasa affords an unanswerable case against the proposals agreed to by Lord George Hamilton with reference to the Sudan.

The "Precedent" of 1885.

The first part of the correspondence may be briefly described. In February, 1885, Lord Kimberley telegraphed to the Viceroy that the Home Government would bear the additional expense—in other words, that India must bear the ordinary expense—of the Indian troops despatched to Suakin. The Government of India, in a despatch dated February, 17th, 1885, and referring back to its despatch of August 4th, 1882, protested against the charge in terms which have a direct bearing upon the present question:—

"Whatever may be the view taken with regard to former precedents, we are quite content that the present case should also be judged upon its merits, considering, as we do, that it is beyond all question one in which no part of the expenditure incurred, whether additional or otherwise, should be charged to Indian revenues. There no question now of the safety of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Suez Canal, which was urged in 1882 as a reason why the Indian Government should bear its share in the expenditure then to be incurred. The operations taking place in the Sudan have no connexion with any Indian interests, and lie altogether outside the sphere of our responsibilities. We can look for neither advantage nor loss from them. The pretensions and the aims of the leaders of the rising in Africa are a matter of indifference to the Government of India, which is in no way interested in disputing or putting down by force the claims of political or religious pretenders in regions of the world remote from its own limits and from those of its neighbours. We should, indeed, on these grounds, be justified in strongly opposing the employment of Indian troops on the present occasion; but, while we are not in a position to refuse the assistance which is now asked of us, we cannot allow that our assent should be supposed to imply a readiness on our part to defray any portion whatever, whether ordinary or additional, of the charges which our assistance will entail."

The Government of India added a general caution which is certainly not less apposite to-day:

"We are further deeply impressed with the conviction that no better check could be placed on the inconvenience and danger arising from the employment of Indian troops outside the sphere of Indian interests, than by insisting on the principle that, in cases such as the present, her Majesty's Government should admit and discharge the obligation of defraying all expenditure necessitated by a course of action which has no bearing upon those interests. The disposal of Indian revenues for other purposes than those which are strictly connected with the legitimate needs of Indian expenditure is a matter which is watched with increasing concern by all sections of the community in this country."

To this despatch Lord Kimberley replied that the resolution authorising the charge upon India had been adopted in the House of Commons *before the despatch was received!* He enclosed the correspondence which had passed between the Treasury and the India Office, and which, by the way, illustrates one of the most interesting points established by the correspondence as a whole—namely, that in these transactions a good deal depends upon the personal strength or compliance of the Secretary of State for India. In this case the Treasury had suggested that the ordinary expenses of the borrowed troops should be borne by India, and two days later Lord Kimberley, apparently without demur, accepted the proposal.

In a later despatch, dated February 9th, 1886, the Government of India argued that the circumstances of the case had changed since the previous March, and that the ordinary expenses of the troops should, at any rate, no longer continue to be borne by India. From the date on which the bulk of the British troops were withdrawn the Government of India considered that "the object and character of the expedition were entirely changed," and that the case of the Indian troops left in Suakin as a garrison could hardly be said to be covered by the letter of the authorising resolution, and certainly did not fall within its spirit. On these grounds the Government of India suggested that India should be relieved from payment with effect from May 15th, 1885—the date on which active operations were held to have ceased.

LORD CROSS'S LEGACY.

Lord Kimberley's reply was eminently characteristic. It was that the Indian garrison at Suakin was under existing arrangements to be relieved early in May, 1886; that if the withdrawal took place at that date it would be "undesirable to raise any question with the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury"; but that if the withdrawal were postponed beyond that date a representation should be made "with a view to the ordinary cost being added to the expenses now borne by the British revenues, so that no part of the cost may thenceforward fall on Indian revenues."

This reply was, of course, as illogical as Sir A. Arbuthnot's admission cited above, and the Government of India, in a spirited rejoinder, easily demolished it:

"In our financial letter of the 9th February, 1886, No. 53, we explained why we considered that India should be relieved of the ordinary cost of the Indian troops and vessels employed in connexion with the garrisoning of Suakin, with effect from the 15th May, 1885. No reason has been assigned for the rejection of our claim, and Lord Kimberley has, we submit, practically admitted its validity, by allowing that, if there was any further detention of Indian troops at Suakin, the Treasury should be asked to consent to the ordinary cost of these troops being also borne by Imperial revenues. In effect our claim would appear to be fully as equitable for the period between May, 1885, and May, 1886, as it would be for any subsequent period."

Unfortunately Lord Kimberley was never required to deal with this reply. A change of Government had, in the meantime, placed Lord Cross at the India Office. But Lord Cross did the next best thing to accepting the Government of India's contention. He virtually promised that the unfairness should not be repeated. Writing to the Viceroy on February 3rd, 1887, he said:

"While I was not prepared to support the proposal of your Government, I deemed it right that the Treasury should be made acquainted with your Excellency's view; and I took the opportunity to urge on them that, in the event of any occasion hereafter arising for the employment of Indian troops on duties not directly attributable to the requirements of your Government or at a distance from India, no portion of the expense should be charged against India without your Excellency's concurrence."

What Lord Cross actually wrote to the Treasury was:

"The Secretary of State for India in Council feels that there is much force in the general scope of the arguments of the Government of India, and desires to take this opportunity of expressing his earnest hope that on any future occasion, when Indian troops are employed on duties not directly attributable to the requirements of the Government of India or despatched to a country distant from India, no portion of the expenses of such troops may be charged to India without the full assent and concurrence of the Government of that country."

And the Treasury replied:—

"Their lordships make no doubt that, should the occasion again arise for employing Indian troops outside India, the views of the present Government of India and of the present Secretary of State for India in Council on the question of the expense of such employment will be respectfully weighed by the Imperial Government of the day."

Such was the legacy bequeathed by the transactions of 1885.

THE CASE OF MOMBASA.

We pass now to the second part of the correspondence. Here the point is that Lord George Hamilton repudiated last February a claim admittedly stronger than that which he acceded to in May.

On February 20th, 1896, Lord Salisbury wrote from the Foreign Office asking whether the Government of India could send a regiment from Bombay

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to Mombasa, as "the state of affairs" in British East Africa had "recently assumed a serious aspect." "The expenses," he added, "which might be incurred would be borne by her Majesty's Government."

On the following day Lord Salisbury, repenting this equitable undertaking, wrote that "it is *presumed* that the precedents *could* be followed of former employment of Indian troops in Africa"—namely, that India should pay the ordinary expenses. The words we have italicised are interesting, especially as Lord Salisbury's second thoughts were evidently inspired by the Treasury. For the letter concluded: "His Lordship would be glad to learn *whether the Treasury could be informed* that a similar arrangement would be adopted" in the case of Mombasa.

Lord George Hamilton's reply to this ungenerous afterthought was admirable—so admirable as to supply an instructive commentary upon his later compliance in the case of the troops despatched to Suakin. The Under Secretary for India wrote to the Foreign Office on February 27th:—

"In reply, I am to express Lord George Hamilton's opinion that there is no justification for charging upon Indian revenues any portion of the cost of this force so long as it is employed out of India and for purposes exclusively Imperial. In a letter dated the 25th of March, 1890, the Government of India lays down as a principle that, when circumstances and the safety of India permit, aid should be freely given to the Imperial Government; but that, when the objects of the expedition or campaign are unconnected with India, the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn from India should be paid by the Imperial exchequer, just as the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn from England for an Indian expedition would be paid by Indian revenues. It appears to his lordship that this principle is sound, and that, if the course suggested in your letter were adopted, the result would be that the cost of the operations would in effect be shared between India and the United Kingdom."

"A STRONGER" CLAIM."

It is noteworthy that the reply to this letter came, not from the Foreign Office, but from the Treasury. It was a financier's endeavour—characterised by a wealth of misplaced ingenuity—to show, in the interests of his accounts, that the objects for which an Indian regiment was required in East Africa were really "connected with India." The trade of Zanzibar, the construction of the Uganda Railway by Indian coolies, the chance of Indian trade with the interior, and, as a matter of course, "prestige with the Arab races and Muhammadan tribes," all were pressed indifferently into the service of a hopeless theory. But Sir Francis Mowatt's letter contained one important paragraph which it is worth while to cite in full:—

"*It seems to my lords that a stronger claim can be made out in the present case for the retention of the charge for ordinary pay and allowances of the regiment upon Indian funds than existed in the case of either the Abyssinian war of* 1867 *or the Sudan expedition of* 1885. In both the latter cases the Secretary of State for India in Council agreed to pay the ordinary charges of unreplaced Indian troops without demur. No specific grounds for consent were given in either case. It was taken for granted that India was largely interested in those regions, not so much commercially as in regard to prestige with the Arab races and Muhammadan tribes. In the present case, over and above the latter consideration, it seems to my lords that Indian commercial interests are very largely involved."

Yet although the Treasury described its claim in the case of Mombasa as stronger than the precedent of 1885, Lord G. Hamilton stood firm and dismissed it. His reply contained some reflections and comparisons which may well be placed on record:—

"It is urged that such a course [*i.e.*, to charge the ordinary expenses upon India] would be in accordance with the precedents of the Abyssinian Expedition of 1867 and the Egyptian Expedition of 1885, and that Indian interests are closely involved in the maintenance of peace on the coast of East Africa. On this point I am desired to observe that great objection has been taken by the Government of India to any extension of the principle adopted on those occasions, and to the absence of reciprocity in such arrangements. It cannot be disputed that Imperial interests are largely involved in the maintenance of peace on the frontiers of India, and in the security of the trade in that country, yet, when it has been necessary to obtain fresh troops from the United Kingdom, their ordinary pay has been borne by the revenues of India from the day of their embarkation from England. Lord George Hamilton is unable to admit that there is any more ground for debiting to India a portion of the expenses of troops sent for special service in the East Africa Protectorate than of those raised in India for ordinary service in that Protectorate."

And again:—

"In your letter much stress is laid on the Consular reports and statistics of Zanzibar as showing that the expedition is 'connected with India.' With much greater force could it be shown that British interests are connected with the trade of India, but, as already observed, no assistance is given by the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in defraying the charges of the military force in India."

Still the Treasury was not satisfied, but on April 29th made a further representation to Lord George Hamilton, consisting of wire-drawn arguments. The value of Lord George Hamilton's rejoinder lies in his destruction of the propositions (*a*) that India contributes too little to the navy, and (*b*) that it is fair to charge India with the ordinary expenses of borrowed troops because, if the troops were not borrowed, their expenses would fall upon India:—

"As regards your remarks on the question of reciprocity, Lord George Hamilton does not wish to enter into that controversy. He cannot, however, admit that, in regard to naval defence, India is under any special obligation because the protection of the general trade of the United Kingdom in Eastern seas is undertaken by the Admiralty at the cost of Imperial revenues; or that, in the great crisis of the maintenance of British supremacy in India, an undue amount of the charge was thrown upon the United Kingdom, since India, besides bearing the whole cost of the extra force, from the date of embarkation, paid also the charges in England of the depôts of the regiments sent to India, in addition to the burden of interest resulting from an augmentation of her debt by forty-six millions.

"On the argument that troops lent, and not replaced, can continue to be paid for by India without adding to her burdens, I am to point out that the work of the army must necessarily be performed by a smaller force than is deemed requisite, thereby entailing a risk, even if it be not shown in a financial aspect, and that India would be confessedly paying for the employment of a force beyond her own frontiers from which she derives no benefit."

It would seem that Lord George Hamilton overlooked this reply when he came to deal with the Sudan question. Indeed, his whole attitude towards the Treasury in the Mombasa case makes his subsequent surrender quite inexplicable on any considerations which a Secretary of State for India—member of the Cabinet though he is—is supposed to admit.

"A MASTERPIECE OF MELANCHOLY MEANNESS.

We come now to the third part of the correspondence—that, namely, which contains the history

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of the Home Government's "melancholy meanness" in the case of Suakin. As this matter is discussed at some length on another page, we confine ourselves here to a summary of the documents. It was on May 5th that Lord George Hamilton telegraphed to Lord Elgin that "her Majesty's Government would probably send demand for Indian troops to garrison Suakin in a few days." Two days later Lord George Hamilton telegraphed particulars of the force which "the Egyptian authorities demand." (The repeated use of this phrase is, by the way, a significant commentary upon the later suggestion that India was really co-operating in an expedition closely allied with Indian interests.) The Viceroy replied at once that some of the best Indian troops should be sent, and, on May 8th, added:

"We assume that no portion of the expenses, either ordinary or extraordinary, will be borne by Indian revenues, and entirely concur with views expressed in India Office Letter to the Treasury, dated 15th April, subject, Cost of Native Regiment, Mombasa."

This rather neat reference to the Mombasa case failed in its purpose. On May 9th Lord George Hamilton telegraphed to Lord Elgin:

"As regards cost, Treasury here propose to pay whole cost of battalion at Mombasa, and for these troops to follow precedent of 1884, by which India paid ordinary, and Imperial all extra, expenditure. This seems to me fair, but subject will be discussed in Council here, where views of your Government will be fully considered."

This telegram is one of the most remarkable documents in the White-book. It is to be noted:

(i) That the Treasury again appears as the author of the financial proposal;

(ii) That Lord George Hamilton, instead of resisting the proposal as he did in the case of Mombasa, had already made up his mind that the charge upon India was fair;

(iii) That Lord George Hamilton appears to associate the Mombasa loan with the Suakin loan, and, by a sort of "reduction on taking a quantity," to agree that if the Home Government paid in one case, India might fairly be charged in the other case;

(iv) That Lord George Hamilton nevertheless promised "full consideration" of the views of the Government of India—a promise which was not fulfilled, as he gave notice of the authorising resolution in the House of Commons before the despatch of the Government of India had left India.

LORD ELGIN'S TELEGRAM.

On May 12th Lord George Hamilton telegraphed to the Viceroy that an early decision in London was "very desirable as to the cost of the troops sent to Suakin," and requested the Government of India to send the substance of its views by telegram. In reply the Government of India telegraphed as follows, under date May 14th:

"We are unanimously of opinion that Indian interests are not involved in present military operations in Egypt, and respectfully protest against Indian revenues being used to defray any of the expenses of Indian contingent under orders for Suakin. As pointed out in India Office Letter of 15th April to Treasury, we have grave objection to precedent of Suakin expedition, 1885, being followed, and to absence of reciprocity in such arrangements between England and India. We commend to your attention specially our Financial Despatch, No. 53, of 17th February, 1885, to Lord Kimberley. The argument that some ordinary expenditure might be saved to Indian revenues by payment from other sources for troops absent from India (see Treasury Letter of 27th February, 1885) leaves out of sight the fact that while troops are absent they are not available for our needs. Our army is scarcely sufficient for our own purposes, and in now complying with Imperial requirements we undertake the risk of an emergency coming upon us while our army is reduced below the recognised minimum. If her Majesty's Government add to our responsibilities by calling upon India for native troops to serve at an unhealthy station like Suakin in the worst season in order to avoid risk of sending troops from England, we strongly urge that they should not at the same time make India pay for native troops while not available for Indian needs. When British troops are required for India, Indian revenues are charged with whole cost from date of embarkation to date of return, and India bears expense of raising and training troops sent annually to this country. In the present case it is not desired to make any charge for cost of raising and training troops which have been placed at disposal of her Majesty's Government. Despatch follows."

"AFTER FULL DISCUSSION"!

Lord George Hamilton, as we have seen, had promised that the views of the Government of India should be "fully considered." Yet on the day after the receipt of the Viceroy's telegram he telegraphed in reply:—

"After full discussion and consideration of your telegraphic summary, Council are of opinion that precedent of 1885 is applicable to cost of expedition to Suakin, and have resolved accordingly."

In reply to a further request that final decision should be postponed until the despatch had been received, Lord G. Hamilton replied that it was impossible. On June 2nd, however—after the inconvenient disclosures of the Italian Green-books—he changed his mind, and, although the authorising resolution had already been placed on the Order Book of the House of Commons, the debate was postponed until after the receipt of the Government of India's despatch, dated June 2nd.

LORD ELGIN'S DESPATCH.

This masterly document, which fills some ten pages of the White-book, does the greatest credit to its authors, and has doubtless helped in no small degree to produce the present state of feeling in England—which, as we remark elsewhere, promises to prevent any future recurrence of the "melancholy meanness" now perpetrated.

The despatch opens with a *résumé* of the proceedings which we have summarised above. Then follows a survey of the occasions upon which Indian troops have been employed "outside Indian limits on duties not directly connected with the interests of India," the Government of India having "consistently opposed the appropriation of Indian revenues for these purposes." There is a long quotation from Lord Ripon's famous despatch of August 4th, 1882, which referred, *inter alia*, to the debate on the Abyssinian Expedition in 1867, and the Protests of Mr. Fawcett and Lord Salisbury (then Lord Cranborne).

INDIA AND EGYPT.

Passing on to the Egyptian Expedition of 1882, Lord Elgin's despatch gives a valuable summary of the objections then urged by the Government of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India. This summary is so apposite to the recent discussion that it may well be given here in full:—

"(*a*) That the interests of India were not involved to such an extent in the maintenance of the established rights, either of the Sultan, or of the Khedive, or of the people of Egypt, or of the foreign bondholders, as to justify, so far as those interests only were concerned, a resort to arms, and, in consequence, the expenditure of large sums of money which must be borne by the Indian taxpaying community. The Government of India considered that, so long as Egyptian policy was regarded as a matter of Imperial concern, and they were required to lend temporarily, and conditionally on the cost being borne by the English Treasury, whatever military aid could, without detriment to Indian interests, be afforded to give effect to the policy of her Majesty's Government, consultation with them was unnecessary. But, if any part of the expenditure thus involved was to be borne by Indian revenues, they claimed to express their opinion freely, before any such charge was laid upon India, as they could scarcely conceive any subject upon which the Government of India, as representing the people of this country, could have a clearer or better claim to be heard. And, while recognising the security which has been provided by the legislature against any appropriation of the Indian revenues being made without a full consideration of Indian interests, they submitted 'that before Parliament is called to deliberate on a question of this importance, it would be advisable that it should be placed in possession of the opinions of the Government of India, and should have an opportunity of learning any objections which that Government may entertain to Indian revenues being made to bear all the charges on account of an expedition carried on beyond the frontiers of her Majesty's Indian possessions.'

"(*b*) That the sole material interest which India possessed in Egypt was, that the transit of ships through the Suez Canal should be assured. The statistical information at the disposal of the Government of India did not enable them accurately to apportion between England and India the extent to which either country was interested in the Suez Canal. It was, however, quite certain that the interest of England was far greater than that of India; for not only was all, or very nearly all, the shipping under the British flag passing through the Canal owned by her Majesty's British subjects, but also England was at least as much interested as India in the British-Indian trade; whilst the remaining trade from England to the East, as well as the trade from foreign countries to British Colonies in the East, constituted a wholly British interest. While readily admitting that India was more interested in the Suez Canal than Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, the Australian Colonies, Tasmania, or New Zealand, and, indeed, that the Indian interest in the Canal was greater than that of all those Colonies taken together, the Government of India failed to understand on what principle of political equity India could be called upon to defray any part of the cost of the armed intervention in Egypt, unless the Australian and other colonies were called upon to pay their proportionate share.

"(*c*) That the proposal was likely to exercise an injurious effect upon the political connection between England and India. The Government of India considered that, if the lesson were once learnt that, a war having been commenced in which large English and relatively small Indian interests were involved, a considerable portion of the cost of that war might, nevertheless, be readily thrown upon the Indian taxpayers, a strong temptation would arise to revert to this procedure and that thus the political connection between India and England would be subject to a severe strain. That any such tendency as that alluded to should gain ground in England would, the Government of India thought, be inconsistent with those high principles by which they felt assured her Majesty's Government would wish the political action of England to be guided. From the Indian point of view, the baneful effect of any such tendency was so obvious as scarcely to require indication; and the Government of India could conceive nothing which was more likely to alienate from them the feelings of the natives of this country than that it should be thought that the action of her Majesty's Government, even though approved by Parliament, did not partake of a beneficent nature, but was rather directed towards imposing burdens on the Indian taxpayers, with a view to reducing those which might more properly be borne by the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. The Government of India believed that at no period of Indian history had the natives of India been more contented and more loyally disposed towards the rule of her Majesty the Queen Empress than then; and that at no time had the satisfactory signs of moral and material progress been more prominent. They therefore most earnestly deprecated the proposed measure as being calculated to check the current of that contentment, loyalty, and progress. They pointed out that the taxpaying community of England is among the wealthiest, whilst that of India is among the poorest, in the world; and that it could not, surely, be in consonance with justice or sound Imperial policy that the wealthy and dominant race should relieve itself of charges at the expense of the poor and subject race, if the smallest doubt could be thrown on the equity of such a proceeding."

The Question of "Saving Money."

Then comes the "precedent" of 1885, which we have already summarised above. We may cite here the observations of the Government of India on the precious plea that as India pays the expenses of her troops when they are not borrowed she is fairly required to pay those expenses when the troops are borrowed:—

"In his letter of the 27th February, 1885, the Secretary to the Treasury remarked that, 'as my lords understand the proposed arrangement, there is no desire, on the part of the Indian Government, to save money by means of the expedition.' The Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, in putting forward this plea, seemed to have overlooked what took place in the case of the Mutiny of 1857. As Lord Lawrence pointed out in his Minute of the 20th January, 1868 (quoted in paragraph 5, Government of India Financial Despatch, No. 239, dated 4th August, 1882): 'All the troops and all the material which were sent from England to aid in putting down the Mutiny in 1857 and 1858 were paid for out of Indian revenues. It was never urged that, because this measure afforded a temporary relief to the British exchequer, a portion of the ordinary cost of these troops should be paid by England. It is true that England had to raise more troops in the place of those supplied to India on that occasion, but not at all to the extent of those which were sent out to this country.' India also paid for the large depôts which were established in England at that time (some 19,000 strong), and which were maintained after the emergency had passed away. England, therefore, saved money by the supply of troops to India, although there can be no question that the Imperial interests of England were deeply and directly concerned in the suppression of the Mutiny, while, on the other hand, India is not interested in the present operations in the Sudan."

"The Arrangement now Proposed."

Passing on, the Government of India calls attention to what we have described above as "Lord Cross's Legacy," and to Lord George Hamilton's admirable demolition of the "stronger claim of the Treasury in the Mombasa case. "We heartily recognise," write Lord Elgin and his colleagues, "the support thus accorded to our Government, and would express our full concurrence in the views held by your lordship, more especially in regard to the absence of reciprocity in such arrangements." But Lord G. Hamilton's attitude on that occasion only made it more "difficult to understand why the principles therein accepted, and for which we have been so long contending, should now be at once departed from in the case of the Indian troops proceeding to Suakin." Then, after a very just complaint as to the manner in which its claims and arguments had been met, the Government of India concluded its despatch as follows:—

"To the arrangement now proposed, we must, as we did in 1885, most strongly demur. The operations now taking place

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

in the Sudan lie altogether outside the sphere of our responsibilities. So far as we are acquainted with the policy and intentions of Her Majesty's Government, as they appear from the ministerial statements in Parliament, the present expedition on the Nile was determined upon to repel a possible advance of Dervish troops in the Nile valley or against Tokar and Suakin, and to act as a diversion for the help and for the relief of the Italians at Kassala. His Highness the Khedive, according to the statement made by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the 30th March in the House of Commons, informed the Sultan that the British and Egyptian Governments had agreed that the moment was opportune for endeavouring to bring back Dongola, which is part of a province formerly held by Egypt in the Sudan, under Egyptian administration. In order to strengthen Suakin, and to set free Egyptian troops for employment on the Nile, we have been asked to provide a garrison composed of troops from the native army in India. We cannot perceive any Indian interests, however remote, which are involved in carrying out the policy above described; it cannot be alleged that the safety of the Suez Canal is involved; and the taxpayers of India, who have to bear the cost of the ordinary charges of the Indian troops proceeding to Suakin, will hardly comprehend the reasons for taxing them for troops which are not serving in India, in order to maintain order on the Egyptian frontier, to reconquer part of an Egyptian province, or to assist the Italian forces. The objections which we urged in 1885 against Indian revenues being burdened with any portion of the expenditure caused by the expedition to the Sudan, which was undertaken that year, apply with equal force to the present occasion; and, as it would appear from the subsequent correspondence on the subject referred to in paragraphs 10-14 of this despatch, that our representations did appeal in a sensible degree to both Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross, we may be permitted to think that our views might also have influenced the resolution passed in Parliament in 1885 had the despatch containing them been laid before it in time for consideration.

"We would point out that her Majesty's Government add to our responsibilities by calling upon us to furnish Indian troops for service at an unhealthy station like Suakin, in the worst season of the year, in order to avoid the risk involved in sending troops for the purpose from England; during the absence of those troops we have to govern India with an army smaller than our needs impose upon us, and we cannot too strongly urge therefore, that, whilst our responsibilities are thus increased, India should not at the same time be called upon to pay for troops not available for Indian needs. India has already borne the expense of raising and training troops now placed at the disposal of her Majesty's Government; and we consider that this advantage, for which we do not propose to charge the Imperial Government, is the only concession which should be allowed at the expense of Indian revenues.

"We have already adverted in this despatch to the opinions of the Government of India previously recorded, showing that the imposition on Indian revenues of burdens for services in which India is in no way interested would be an impolitic course to adopt. We would add that, since the passing of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, the annual Financial Statement of the Governor-General in Council comes under discussion in the Legislative Council of the Governor-General; and, from the discussions which have since taken place, it will be seen that the finances are watched and scrutinized, and their utilisation for purposes which are viewed as illegitimate, or unauthorised, is vigorously challenged. So far as we are able to judge from ordinary sources of information, public opinion in this country is practically unanimous on this question.

"In these circumstances we feel it our duty, in the interests of the country of which the administration is entrusted to us, to protest once more in the strongest terms against a policy which burdens Indian revenues with expenditure connected with services in which India has no interest; which is unjust to India, because it applies, to the payment of Indian troops lent to England, a different principle from that which England imposes when English troops are lent to India; and which is inexpedient, because it exposes our Government to attacks to which there is no adequate answer. We ask that the principles for which we have all along contended may be accepted and strictly applied, and that in accordance with those principles Indian revenues may be relieved of all expenditure connected with the Indian troops now proceeding to Suakin. We would therefore request that this despatch may now be laid before her Majesty's Government, with a view to the decision already given in the present case being reconsidered, and we trust that your lordship will be pleased to accord to our representations your fullest support."

LORD G. HAMILTON'S REPLY.

The following is the text of Lord G. Hamilton's reply, dated June 30th:—

"My Lord,—I have received, and have carefully considered in Council, your Excellency's telegrams of the 14th of May and 1st of June, and your letter of the 2nd of June, No. 134, in which you deal with the incidence of the cost of the expedition to Suakin.

"2. It is impossible to say that the decisions which have been arrived at on previous occasions with regard to the distribution of charge for troops lent by India to Great Britain, or by Great Britain to India, are such that any very clear or definite doctrine can be drawn from them. But, speaking generally, it may be said that the following principles have latterly been recognised, and are in accordance with the spirit of justice and equity which should govern the relations between the two Governments.

"3. In the first place, it may be laid down that on all occasions when the temporary loan of a military force is urgently required, either by Great Britain or by India, such assistance will be promptly given, so far as the ability, resources, and situation of either country at the time may permit.

"4. In the next place, it would seem to be established that, if the object for which such assistance is required is one in which the Government supplying the troops has no special interest beyond that which must be common to all members of the Empire, the whole cost of the force, so long as it is required, including both ordinary and extraordinary charges, must be borne by the Government that needs its assistance.

"5. In the third place, if the circumstances are such that the Government supplying the troops has a distinct and special interest in the matter at stake, then, although that interest may be less strong than that of the Government requiring assistance, the Government supplying the troops should be content to bear, in one form or another, a portion of the burden which the operations involve. For instance, it might in this case recognise its interest in the matter by dispensing for a time with their services at home, while retaining them, as usual, in its pay.

"6. I believe that these principles will command a general assent. The difficulty lies in their application to each case as it arises; and I proceed to state the reasons which have led her Majesty's Government to decide, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State for India in Council, that, while Great Britain bears the whole charge, ordinary and extraordinary, of the force recently sent from India to Mombasa, the extraordinary charges only of the Suakin force shall be recovered from the treasury chest.

"7. It is unnecessary, for the present purpose, to enter upon a discussion of the objects of the military operations of which the Suakin Expedition forms a part, inasmuch as it has been publicly stated on behalf of her Majesty's Government, that among them is the maintenance and development of orderly and settled government in Egypt.

"8. The Government of India has no greater interest than the maintenance of rapid and secure transit, in times of peace and of war alike, whether for commercial or for military purposes, between India and the United Kingdom. This is true of India in a sense in which it is true of no other great dependency of the British Empire; for it is upon Great Britain that India relies for the recruitment of the most important (though not the most numerous) part of its civil and military establishments, for army reliefs, for Government stores of all kinds, and, in short, for a large and essential portion of the machinery of administration and defence. It is, therefore, obvious that, apart from all considerations of trade, the preservation of free communication by the shortest route with a country on which she is so largely dependent, is to India a matter of vital importance.

"9. It is equally manifest that, for this purpose, the maintenance in Egypt of a settled and orderly government, in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

friendly relations with the British Empire, s an indispensable condition; and that the measures now in progress on the Egyptian frontier must be regarded as an integral part of the policy entailed upon her Majesty's Government by the actual situation of affairs in that country. Assuming these statements to be incontrovertible as matters of fact, I cannot draw from them any other conclusion than that India has a material and special interest in supporting that policy, and in the success of the present operations.

"10 For this important object, then, India is not asked to incur the smallest additional expenditure or to impose the slightest extra taxation. The only sacrifice which she is asked to make for a cause in which she is so deeply concerned is to take the risk (such as it is) of dispensing for a short time with the services of about 2,500 troops out of the army, European and native, numbering in all about 225,000, which she keeps in her pay.

"11. I have no wish to make light of this demand. It is perfectly true that the strength of the Indian army has been fixed at what is no more than necessary to meet certain emergencies which may suddenly arise. The weakening of that army, in however small a degree, by sending a portion of it out of the country, is in itself an undesirable step, not to be assented to without good reason. But this is a risk which must be taken into account by every Government whenever a military expedition has to be sent beyond its own frontiers; it has indeed been frequently undertaken by the Government of India; and any argument founded on this consideration, even if it had greater force than I can attach to it, can have little or no bearing on the question of the allotment of charges. Looking to the general condition of affairs in India and elsewhere, to the comparatively small size of the Suakin force, and to the fact that the purpose for which it is required is strictly temporary, I say with confidence that the risk is one which, in the circumstances, India may not unreasonably be asked to incur.

"12. This, then, is the measure of India's contribution towards the object in view. There is no question of her incurring any pecuniary burden. The only effect of the recent decision, so far as she is concerned, is that 2,500 soldiers, who would otherwise, by their presence in India, have been increasing to some small extent the security of her Majesty's Indian possessions, will, instead, be actively engaged for a few months in promoting Indian, as well as British, interests by their presence elsewhere.

"13. I desire to call your Excellency's attention to the fact that I have throughout dwelt upon the temporary nature of this assistance as an essential condition of the arrangement to which I have agreed. As you will perceive from the correspondence which I enclose, this arrangement holds good only till the 31st December, if the force should be required so long. If, on the other hand, the Indian troops remain longer at Suakin, undoubtedly the question of charging India with any portion of their expenses will again be most carefully considered. And I may also observe that if the force were not, as it is, a small one, the proposed distribution of cost would have been impossible; for, if the period had been of indefinite length, or if the Indian establishment had been materially reduced, it would in either case have been necessary to raise a force to replace that which has been lent; and in that event the situation would obviously be entirely changed. There is, therefore, no fear that India will be permanently weakened by measures of this kind, or that she will come to be regarded as a source from which troops can be drawn, at small expense, for purposes wholly or mainly British. The precedent now created can only apply to loans of small bodies of troops, for short periods, and for purposes in which India has a substantial interest.

"14. This being so, it appears hardly necessary to point out that there is no analogy between the arrangement under discussion and that which exists for the supply of a permanent European force in India. In this latter case, the only alternative would be the revival of the system which formerly prevailed, viz., the maintenance in India of a special force, recruited in England, the whole charge for which, including the cost of recruitment, training, and pensions, would necessarily fall on Indian revenues. It is therefore only reasonable that India should, as stated in your telegram of 14th May, bear the whole charge, from the date of embarkation to that of return of the European force which for her own purposes she permanently requires; but the temporary loan of a small force for a definite object of common interest is a wholly different matter.

"15. Your Excellency has not failed to observe that, on the occasion of the recent despatch of a force to Mombasa, I represented to the Treasury that the preservation of order in that district was an object in which India had no special interest, and that it was accordingly right that the whole cost of the expeditionary force should be borne by the United Kingdom. To this representation the Treasury, as you will gather from the correspondence which I enclose, have agreed. This is sufficient to show that her Majesty's Government have no wish whatever to depart from the principles which I have stated in the earlier part of this despatch. But, as regards the Suakin expedition, after careful consideration in Council, it appeared to me wholly impossible to maintain that India had not a special interest in the success of the Egyptian operations. I came, therefore, with much reluctance, to the conclusion that I was unable to support your Excellency's view of which I was already fully aware.

"16. In conclusion, I desire to refer to the opinion which you express, that your Government had not sufficient opportunity of stating its views before my decision was arrived at. I much regret that you should consider that you have any cause of complaint in this respect; but I cannot admit that any undue haste was used, or that I had not before me full materials for a decision. In my telegram of the 12th of May I had informed you that an early decision was very desirable, and that I wished to be put in possession of the substance of your views by telegraph. In reply I received your telegram of the 14th May, which must have been sent with the knowledge that on its receipt the matter would probably be decided. I think, therefore, that I was justified in assuming that it contained all that you considered material for enabling me to appreciate your view of the case. And as regards the correspondence of 1882, to which your refer, I may remind you that on that occasion the circumstances closely resembled those which now exist. Then, as now, the assistance of India was required to avert a danger which threatened the cause of order and good government in Egypt; and the distribution of cost which the Government of India then recommended was identical with that on which her Majesty's Government have decided in the present case.

"17. It is a matter of much concern to me to find myself, on a matter of this kind, unable to concur in your Excellency's opinion. But, in view of the considerations which I have put before you, I am not without hope that your lordship's Government may be disposed to admit the justice of the decision at which, after full deliberation, her Majesty's Government have arrived."

"ACKNOWLEDGED WITH THANKS."

We discuss Lord G. Hamilton's reply elsewhere. It only remains to add here that the present arrangement is to continue "until the end of the current calendar year," and that the Treasury "acknowledged with thanks" the decision of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

IV.—OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

A CHORUS OF CONDEMNATION.

It would be easy to fill the whole of the present number of "INDIA." with extracts from the Press of the United Kingdom in condemnation of the policy adopted by Lord Salisbury's Government in charging upon the revenues of India the ordinary expenses of the Indian troops despatched to Suakin.

It is impossible, however, to do more than quote from some of the leading journals on either side of politics. Nothing is more remarkable, or more full of promise for the future, than the vehemence with which the leading organs of public opinion,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

without distinction of political party, have raised a chorus of condemnation of the policy of "melancholy meanness."

We may add that three daily newspapers in particular have distinguished themselves by the zeal, the thoroughness, and the admirable persistence of their opposition to the Government's policy—namely, the *Times*, the *Daily News*, and the *Manchester Guardian*. Day after day, and week after week, these journals have kept the subject prominently before their readers since the proposal to lay a charge upon India was first hinted at.

PENNY-WISE, POUND-FOOLISH.—*Times.*

"We deeply regret that the Imperial Government have thought fit to overrule the energetic protest of the Viceroy and his Council against the decision to make the Indian Exchequer liable for the ordinary pay and maintenance of the Suakin contingent. The Treasury, of course, has insisted on this measure in the discharge of its primary duty of securing every penny for the Exchequer at home. Against the discharge of that duty there is not a word to be said, except that the able officials of that Department appear sometimes to have never heard of Carlyle's warning that cash payment is not the only *nexus* between man and man, and do not always bear in mind the proverb that penny-wise is pound-foolish. . . . . India is willing to give help in moderation, but, apart from the question of finance, frequent withdrawals from an Indian army, the strength of which is professedly limited to the strict requirements of India herself, and are not expedient. It is easy to dismiss the withdrawal of 2,500 men as a trifle, but the War Office would not consider the demand for that number as trivial. Lord George Hamilton declines to see any resemblance between the case of Indian troops lent for Imperial purposes and that of British troops lent for Indian purposes, as if it was only in the former case that a connection of interest established an obligation. But, surely, of all our Imperial interests there are few greater than the maintenance of our dominion in India."

A LAME APOLOGY.—*Standard.*

The *Standard*—the official organ of the Government—lamely apologised for the resolution as follows:—"We are confident that, when the heat and tumult which have been raised over the question have subsided, the issue will stand revealed in truer and less exaggerated proportions. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer justly pointed out, the military force which has been sent to Suakin is limited, and the time is limited, and, that being so, no Constitutional wrong can be held to hinge on a case of such narrow scope and application. It is easy for critics who are not disposed to question India's interest in Egypt to raise the cry that Egypt and the Canal were in no danger when the Expedition was entered upon. This is emphatically one of those points that must be left to the discretion of the Government of the day, who are in possession of all the facts, secret and open, connected with so delicate a question as our tenure of Egypt, and who cannot reasonably be expected to make a clean breast of each and every argument for their action."—(*July 7th.*)

"THE LANGUAGE OF AN ATTORNEY."—*Daily News.*

"The Secretary of State for India had to meet as strong a case as was ever raised in Parliament or out of it on behalf of the great dependency which he officially represents. His wisest course would have been to recognise that the weight of argument was against him, and to withdraw with the best grace he could assume from a position he should never have taken up. But as he had determined to stand by his despatch of the 30th of June, on which we have commented already, he should have been prepared to deal exhaustively with the whole subject in a comprehensive and statesmanlike spirit. What he actually did was to express the sentiments of an accountant in the language of an attorney. He urged that the sum involved between the two countries, the rich and the poor, the dominant and the subordinate society, was not more than thirty-five thousand pounds. It is a strange blindness which disables him from seeing that this fact is in truth irrelevant, and that if it were material it would be unfavourable to himself."—(*July 7th.*)

THE "EXPERTS" OVER-RULED.—*Manchester Guardian.*

"The opposition to the proposal to charge India with the pay and allowances of the Indian troops at Suakin will be strengthened by a piece of information which Mr. Curzon gave the House of Commons yesterday [July 3rd]. Out of eleven members of the Indian Council in London who voted on the proposal, seven were in its favour and four against it. Thus in London there was a majority of only three in its favour, while at Calcutta it was unanimously condemned by the Viceroy's Council. We are often told that on questions affecting the welfare of the people of India paramount importance should be attached to the opinions of experts in Indian Government. Here is a matter in which, it is well understood, a false step may gravely weaken the attachment of the natives of India to the present form of Goverment, and this is the matter on which Lord Salisbury's Cabinet proposes to overrule the judgment of a considerable aggregate majority of the Anglo-Indian authorities officially consulted at Calcutta and in London."

"THE HEIGHT OF IMPOLICY."—*Daily Chronicle.*

"What does the Government say in reply? Simply that it is so vastly to the interests of India that we should keep control of the Suez Canal, the short route by which our ships and reinforcements would reach her rapidly in time of need, that she should be glad to lend us her help in consolidating our position in Egypt. That is all. At once half a dozen retorts to this argument spring to mind. It would be for our advantage, as an Empire, that India should be well and promptly defended against any attack upon her borders. Yet we should not fail to charge her every penny for our help all the same. Again, it is to the obvious advantage of our Australian colonies and our far eastern colonies and dependencies, that the Suez Canal should be open to us in time of war, yet we do not ask Australia or the rich merchants of Singapore and Shanghai to contribute to our expedition to smash the Mahdi. Lastly, there is the very simple, but, to our thinking, conclusive argument, that the sum at stake is a mere bagatelle, that India is a very poor country, that Great Britain is a very rich one, and that therefore it is the height of impolicy for the Government in such a matter to offend the universal public opinion in India, to say nothing of a very weighty and general sentiment in this country."

"NOT WORTH WHILE."—*Daily Telegraph.*

"Was it worth while, for the sake of this paltry sum, to override the protest of the Viceroy and his Council, and to create feelings of injury and irritation in India? We cannot think so, and what is more we cannot believe that the English public thinks so either. We feel sure that they would have welcomed a Ministerial decision to deal generously with our great, but none too prosperous, Eastern dependency; and the adoption of the opposite course, for so inadequate a pecuniary advantage, is just one of those pieces of mysteriously 'high statesmanship' which the country either fails to understand or assuredly shows no disposition to appreciate."

CANNOT BE SERIOUSLY ARGUED.—*Speaker.*

"There has probably never been a parallel case before in the whole history of the House of Commons. The collapse of the

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
IS
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.

In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb. and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).

Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says: "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

defence was, like the withdrawal of the Education Bill, unique. Yet never did a Ministry stand in sorer need of the backing of their friends. Lord George Hamilton is a broken reed. When he got up, things looked bad for the Government. When he sat down, they were hopeless. He thought it smart and clever to ask who killed Hicks Pasha. He might as well have asked who kill Cock Robin. He made what he apparently supposed to be an attack upon Mr. Morley, who was not in Parliament till 1883, and not in office till 1886. The real objects of his aspersions were the Duke of Devonshire, who will not care twopence, and Mr. Chamberlain, who will not forget the incident as long as he lives. Lord George believes, or pretends to believe, that we confer an immense favour upon India by invading the Sudan. That is not the opinion of a single native Indian, nor of one member of the Indian Government. It cannot be seriously argued, except on the hypothesis that an Imperial interest must always be an Indian one. But Lord George himself discarded that view when he rightly insisted that the whole cost of the Indian contingent at Mombasa should be borne by the Treasury."

"THE CURSE OF MADNESS."—*Saturday Review.*

"Has the curse of madness literally descended upon the Government? The thought is treason. But how account otherwise for conduct which, after repeated warnings from the unanimous Press of the party, and no indistinct menaces from staunch supporters, drives twenty-three Unionists into the Opposition Lobby for the sake of £35,000? It is the pat phrase of the thick-and-thin Government-man that it is only the young and inexperienced members returned at the last election who, in their ignorance, turn against their political pastors and masters. A glance at the division-list of Monday will dispel this illusion. With the exception of Mr. Bhownaggree, whose vote is entitled to special weight, Mr. Fison, and Mr. Moon—we do not include Sir Lewis M'Iver, because he sat in the short Parliament elected in 1895—none of the protestants are new members. Sir Andrew Scoble, it is true, was only returned in 1892; but he has filled the high office of Legal Member of the Governor-General of India's Council, and his vote, like Mr. Bhownaggree's, has a special value derived from personal experience. All the other Unionists who voted with Mr. Morley are men of mature political judgment, and most of them are ordinarily loyal friends of the Government. . . . . No: the theory that the critics of the Government are merely the raw boys who floated in at the last election will not do. There is hardly a name in the list of twenty-three that will not carry weight with some section of the public. In fact, it is a very remarkable protest, made by some of the ablest members of the Unionist party."

A "CHEESEPARING POLICY."—*St. James's Gazette.*

Commenting on July 17th on the vote in the House of Lords, the *St. James's Gazette* wrote in an article headed "A Lost Opportunity":—"The arguments of the supporters of the resolution yield a plentiful crop of reasons for the view that the policy of the Government, in extorting this payment from India, is indefensible. The contention that India is so vitally interested in destroying the rule of the Khalifa, that she may be called upon with justice to pay for troops she lends us for service at Suakin, is an ingenious invention that comes from the Treasury. India is, of course, affected by the safety of the Red Sea, which is geographically and politically a continuation of the Suez Canal; but she is as little affected by what goes on in the heart of the African continent as in the planet Mars. It is not the fact that the war in the Sudan is an Indian war. It is an Egyptian war, and, being Egyptian, a British war, to be fought and paid for by Egypt, or if she prove unequal to the task, by ourselves. The expedition is part of a great Imperial plan, the fruits of which will be reaped by Great Britain rather than by India. The Cabinet should have protected the financial interests of India, regarding itself as an Imperial Cabinet and not as a body to carry out and defend the cheeseparing policy of the officials of the British Treasury."

"THE REVOLT OF THE BRITISH CONSCIENCE."—*Scotsman.*

"The British public are beginning to realise that we have always treated India somewhat ungenerously in connection with these military expeditions, and that, on the plea that it is India's interest to help in keeping open and secure the road to India, charges have been thrown upon the Indian Exchequer which this country ought in fairness to have borne. This is no new thing. It is as old as our possession of an Empire in the East. The new thing is the revolt of the British conscience against forcing India to pay for enterprises in the undertaking of which its Government and people have not only no voice, but a very slight or altogether questionable interest. It is a remarkable fact that in all the cases referred to as precedents for the present charge the British Viceroy and his British Councillors have been unanimous and earnest in their opposition to the demands made upon them by the Home Government, and that British public opinion in India, as well as native opinion, has been very strong on the same side. It is sometimes said that there is no such thing as native public opinion in India, and the statement may be true as regards the great mass of the population. But there is now a large and continually increasing body of educated natives who read newspapers and discuss politics and criticise the conduct of their British rulers and the treatment of India by the British Government."

"MAKING THE SPECTATORS HOWL."—*Westminster Gazette.*

"The point of principle, then, seems to be on the side of India, which has every reason to resist a most dangerous precedent. Other Governments, it is true, have strained the point against her, but they have always done it with an uncomfortable conscience, and, when pressed, have vowed that it should be positively the last time. But if the British case were as strong as it is weak, we should still say that the thing ought only to be done after the gravest deliberation. . . . . Faced with the fact that the Viceroy's Council in India is unanimously against us, we proceed to justify ourselves by the same kind of casuistry as, say, the partisans of Cambridge employ to justify the wides and no-balls which saved the follow-on last Friday. The analogy is really not a bad one. A Government, like a cricket team, cannot afford to do things which make the spectaters howl. And, seriously, is it not time that we closed the subscription list for the limited liability expedition and paid up the deficit like men?"

Limits of space prevent us from quoting further. But we may add that leading articles condemning the Government's policy have also appeared in the following journals:—

Birmingham Daily Post, *Pall Mall Gazette*, *National Observer*, *Observer*, *Guardian*, *Daily Graphic*, *Star*, *Leicester Daily Post*, *Glasgow Herald*, *Bradford Observer*, *Western Mercury*, *Eastern Morning News*, *African Review*, *Nottingham Daily Express*, *Grimsby News*, *Court Circular*, *Midland Counties Express*, *Yorkshire Herald*, *Glasgow Daily Record*, *Manchester Evening News*, *Aberdeen Free Press*, *Edinburgh Evening Dispatch*, *Newcastle Daily Leader*, *North British Daily Mail*, *Northern Daily Telegraph*, *Bury Times*, *Leeds Mercury*, *Bristol Mercury*, *Manchester Courier*, *Glasgow Evening Times*, *Oldham Chronicle*, *Liverpool Daily Post*, *Eastern Daily Press*, *Western Press* (Bristol), *Sheffield Independent*, *Western Mail* (Cardiff), *South Wales Daily News*, and many others.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 9. (NEW SERIES.) | SEPTEMBER, 1896. | Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	257
The Alibag Revision Settlement, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	262
The Administration of Justice in India, by J. Dacosta	263
Indian Railway Exploitation	264
Lord Wolseley and the British and Indian Armies	266
An Opportunity for Revision, by A. Nundy	268
The "Budget" Debate: Opinions of the Press	270
Lord G. Hamilton's Optimism	273
Wanted: Effective Scrutiny	274
Wordsworth: His Present and Future Influence	276
Râja Yoga	278
Our London Letter	279
Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee	280
The "Budget" Debate: Official Record	281
Lord Welby's Commission: Evidence of Lord Wolseley and Lord Cromer	282
Reviews: A Social Reformer	284
The Karakoram Himalayas	286
"Om!"	286
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	288
Recent Official Publications	288

Indiana.

The Budget and the Queen's Speech.

IN spite of all requests and remonstrances, the "strongest Government of modern times" limited the debate on the Indian Budget to a single day, and that the last day but one of the Session. We discuss elsewhere the leading features of the debate, and it is not necessary to recall here the criticisms on the Financial Statement which have already appeared in our columns.[1] Lord George Hamilton, reversing the usual procedure, made his statement before the Speaker left the chair. His admitted purpose was to curtail discussion on the amendments, which he described as "purely academic in character." He made no reference to the charge for the Indian force at Suakin, but the frequent passages in which both he and Sir Henry Fowler dwelt upon the wisdom and authority of the Government of India supplied a rather ironical commentary upon that "masterpiece of melancholy meanness." In this connexion, it is interesting to note that the Queen's Speech on the prorogation of Parliament supplied a revised theory of the Sudan expedition, which, however, contained no mention of Indian interests:—

"The hostile movements of the Dervish forces in Egypt along the Valley of the Nile, and against the positions in the occupation of Italy to the east of that river, convinced me that it had become necessary for the Egyptian Government to take steps for arresting their advance.

"By my advice, therefore, and under my sanction, an expedition has been undertaken for the purpose of restoring to the Government of the Khedive, as far as Dongola, the territory which was lost to Egypt ten years ago. The operations are still proceeding, but, by a short and brilliant action at Ferkeh, a considerable proportion of the territory indicated has already been recovered."

In a later paragraph, however, the Queen's Speech referred to India as follows:—

"The peaceful delimitation of the North-Western frontier has proceeded, and further agreements have been made with the Shah of Persia and the Amír of Afghanistan, fixing their territorial limits. Friendly relations have been maintained with the tribes on the road to Chitral and the relief of the garrisons in that country has been effected without difficulty, and with the cordial co-operation of tribesmen in the neighbourhood."

"Peaceful" in this context is rather good. The last sentence should be contrasted with Lord G. Hamilton's speech of August 13th on the Indian Budget, and compared with his speech of February 17th, on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address. On August 13th Lord G. Hamilton said:—

"I am glad to say the relations between our officers and troops and the tribes are steadily improving."

But on February 17th he had said:—

"There has been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regards the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political Officer asking to be incorporated in British territory.

[1] See pp. 97, 98; 129-132; 134, 135; 141-144; 167, 168, etc., etc.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

(Laughter and cheers.) They said they had felt such advantage and security from the presence of the troops" etc., etc.

This confusion of tongues is interesting, but rather embarrassing. In February the only difficulty with the tribes on the road to Chitral arises from their excessive friendliness towards us. Nevertheless, on August 13th we are told that our relations with them are "steadily improving." On the following day we learn that "friendly relations have been maintained." Perhaps what Lord George Hamilton means is that the tribes are gradually getting over their annoyance at the refusal of their request for incorporation in British territory.

Mutual Admiration.

It may be doubted whether compliments and congratulations across the Table have ever before reached the sublime, or ridiculous, height attained by Sir Henry Fowler in the Budget debate. He and Lord George Hamilton, it would seem, have formed a Mutual Admiration Society. We cull at random a few specimens of Sir H Fowler's flowers of oratory:—

"He had to congratulate the noble lord on the satisfactory statement he had made to the House."

"He would not say that he entertained any feeling of envy towards him . . . . but at all events he could not help looking with some feeling of jealous pleasure at the statement the noble lord had been able to make."

"He had always maintained, as the noble lord had done on that occasion, that the true secret of our financial difficulties in India was the difficulty of exchange."

"He had been much gratified to hear that the frontier difficulties were coming to an end."

"The subject in which he took the greatest interest when he was in office was that of the extension of railways in India, and he was very pleased to note the advance which the noble lord had made in this work during the present year."

"He hoped the noble lord would continue to pursue this policy, and in doing so he would confer a great boon on the people of India."

And so forth, and so on. Can we wonder that, at the end of it all, the noble lord was able to say that "the general discussion had been so friendly that he had very little to answer"? Yet Lord George Hamilton had positively reversed Sir Henry Fowler's policy in the two important matters of Chitral and the cotton duties! On the latter subject, indeed, Sir H. Fowler did venture to say a few words. But he defended himself so mildly, and criticised his successor so slightly, that Lord G. Hamilton did not deem the speech worthy of a reply. And the really astounding thing is that Sir H. Fowler, as his speech showed, is substantially in agreement with the contentions urged, and the readjustment proposed, by Sir W. Wedderburn in his speech of May 18th, which Sir H. Fowler so hotly condemned. As for Sir H. Fowler's comparisons of taxation in India and England, and in Madras and Mysore, they have been exploded so often that they can no longer attract serious notice.

Judicial and Executive Functions.

One of the many important subjects which were brought forward in the debate on the Indian Budget is the union of judicial and executive functions in the same officer in India. The Indian National Congress from the time of its foundation has not ceased to call attention to this indefensible combination of duties, and the dangers which are inseparable from it. The subject has, as our readers are aware, been conspicuous for a long time in our columns, and in July last we announced that an important Memorial would shortly be presented to the Secretary of State praying for the separation of the duties of judge from the duties of public prosecutor. The presentation of the Memorial has, we regret to say, been unavoidably postponed for the moment on account of delay in the transit of some important documents from India. The matter is, however, engaging the active attention of the British Committee, and the Memorial will, at the first convenient opportunity, be laid before Lord George Hamilton by a representative deputation of jurists, members of Parliament, and others interested in the question. It is worth noting that Lord George Hamilton, in his brief reply on the Budget debate, described the question as "complicated but important," and added that:—

"The Indian Government were giving great attention to it. The change urged would involved great expenditure, but gradually the Indian Government were working in that direction."

This is a not unsatisfactory statement, if we except the inevitable reference to expenditure. Lord G. Hamilton knows perfectly well that, according to Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt and other experts who have examined the question, the desired change could be brought about without any considerable expense. That is the view of authorities like Sir Richard Garth and Mr. Manomohan Ghose. Mr. Ghose has devoted himself with exemplary vigour to advocacy of the reform, and his two recent and exceedingly valuable pamphlets on the subject are discussed by Mr. Dacosta on another page. We may add that copies of the Memorandum on judicial and executive functions which was circulated by the British Committee last spring, were again distributed to members of the House of Commons in anticipation of the recent Budget debate. It is to be regretted that Sir W. Wedderburn was precluded by the forms of the House from speaking on the subject. Having moved an amendment himself, he had spoken on the main question, and was debarred from speaking again until the motion to go into Committee had been agreed to.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The Candour of the *Englishman*.

In this connexion, we may express the hope that Lord George Hamilton has seen, or will see, an article printed in the *Englishman* of July 28th under the title, "Mr. Ghose and the Magistracy." The *Englishman* not only professes to be, but is, the chief exponent in India of the opinions and prejudices of the Civil Service, and the noteworthy feature of its article, which purports to be a review of Mr. Ghose's pamphlets, is that it frankly acknowledges the "prestige" argument—as opposed to the "great expenditure" argument—to be the basis of the opposition to reform. The *Englishman* refers in terms of scornful amusement to Mr. Ghose's remarks upon the "prestige" argument, as being put forward chiefly in confidential communications:—

"Mr. Ghose is quite shocked at this illustration of official secretiveness, which he seems to base upon the fact that during the debate on the well-known Maimansingh case in the House of Lords in 1893 Lord Kimberley, the then Secretary of State for India, took occasion to contradict a statement to that effect, which had been made by Sir Richard Garth, and to decline to admit in any way that the union of the two powers was maintained in India for any such purpose. We had given Mr. Ghose credit for being too old a bird to be caught with such chaff. To the man in the street Secretaries of State for India are objects more of sorrow than of anger. Their knowledge of the country and its requirements is so infinitesimal that it is impossible to take them seriously; and we must do them the justice to say that it is only the young and more rash among them who, like the present occupant of the office, demand to be accepted as authorities on Indian topics. There is a lamentable partiality for platitudes, which seems to be a hereditary attribute of the Secretary of State for India; and we must confess it is with some surprise that we find Mr. Ghose attaching such profound importance to these well-sounding periods of Lord Kimberley's. Nor do we understand how Mr. Ghose should have persuaded himself that this question of prestige has been sedulously kept in the background. It is far from being a skeleton in the official cupboard."

The *Englishman* proceeds to refer to the opinions of Lord Ulick Browne, Mr. Henry Bell, and Sir James Westland, and to declare in so many words that the "prestige" argument is "the great argument in favour of the retention of the present system." As for the doctrine that one and the same officer ought not to be both thief-catcher and magistrate, public prosecutor and Judge, superintendent of police and Judge in appeal, the *Englishman* dismisses it as "the hidebound and narrow notion" of lawyers. In other words, the contention put forward at the instance of the India Office by Lord Kimberley in the House of Lords, and by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons, is, according to the *Englishman*, so much nonsense put into the mouths of Secretaries of State for the express purpose of misleading Parliament. Whether this remarkable article in the *Englishman* has been written or inspired by Sir James Westland himself, we do not know. But it is a significant and valuable proof of the proposition, consistently urged by the advocates of separation, that the alleged difficulty of expense is a mere pretext, and that the real objection to reform lies in the determination of District Magistrates to keep themselves invested with despotic powers. The candour of the *Englishman* tends to clear the air. It shows precisely the point against which our attack must be directed, and it ought to put Lord George Hamilton on his guard against the departmental reports which, in due course, he will receive from India. Having the *Englishman's* article before him, he can no longer treat seriously the bogey of expenditure. On the contrary, it becomes a question for him how far it is consistent with his dignity to allow dust to be thrown in his eyes by the Indian Civil Service. Sir Charles Elliott does not disguise the fact that his views are entirely in accordance with the views of Sir James Westland, and the opinion of Sir Alexander Mackenzie, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, is known to be the same.

Exchange Compensation Allowance.

The charge for Exchange Compensation Allowance seems to have become an established burden of Rx. 1,000,000 to Rx. 1,500,000 upon the sorely taxed people of India. Since the allowance was first made in 1893 a bonus of over three crores of rupees has been added to the handsome salaries of Indian Civil Servants, with a further prospective donation of nearly a crore and a quarter for the current financial year. Now we have never objected to reasonable compensation in cases of proved hardship. What we have all along protested against, and what we shall continue to protest against, is the unjust and indiscriminate award of this exchange compensation. It may be right and proper, and in the interests of good government, that a civil servant who came out to India twenty years ago, when the rupee was nearly at par, should be compensated by Government for the fall in exchange which has nearly halved his salary. But it is wholly unjust and inexpedient to treat in the same way the officer who joined the Service a few years ago, when exchange was already below 1s. 6d., and when its probable further fall was a matter so notorious that no reasonable man in entering the Indian Civil Service could fail to have appreciated the risk and to have counted the cost. It is eminently desirable that Government should treat its servants well. It is quite unnecessary that the salaries of all Government servants should be increased promiscuously, because the salaries of some have suffered an unlooked-for reduction through the accidents of international finance.

Facts and Figures.

A well-informed correspondent in Lucknow has furnished us with some remarkable figures in relation to this question, which throw considerable light on the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

hollow plea of financial distress among the ruling caste in India. Is it necessary to remind our readers that these very words, "financial distress," were frequently on the lips of the advocates of exchange compensation when it was first granted? Taking the salaries of the civilians in the North-West Provinces and Oudh of two to twenty-two years standing, our correspondent shows that officers up to fifteen or sixteen years' service so far from losing anything by the depreciation in exchange gain enormously. The reason is that men are beginning to retire from the service as soon as they can, which naturally quickens promotion with increased pay for junior men. He pertinently adds: "If compensation allowance is to be given at all it surely should be given to men who have lost by the fall in exchange rather than to those who have gained so greatly." Thus the average monthly salary in rupees of civilians from two to seven years standing has gradually risen from Rs. 581 in 1875 to Rs. 852 in 1895; while the average yearly salary in sterling, despite the heavy fall in exchange and without compensation, has fallen only from £639 in 1875 to £564 in 1895. For officers of eight to twelve years' standing the figures are: 1875, Rs. 959 per mensem, or £945 per annum; 1895, Rs. 1,302 per mensem, or £863 per annum. For officers of thirteen to seventeen years' standing the average salary was in 1875 Rs. 1,121 per mensem, or £1,233 per annum; and in 1895, Rs. 1,813 per mensem, or £1,201 per annum. Now, when it is borne in mind that in any case a large portion of an officer's salary must be spent in India, the enormous increase in the average rupee salaries of civilians from two to seventeen years standing, coupled with the very small decline which, owing to this increase, is shown in their yearly salaries converted into pounds sterling, bears striking testimony to the hasty and inequitable manner in which compensation has been granted. On the other hand, the salaries of officers from eighteen to twenty-two years standing, where the quickening of promotion ceases to operate, have been seriously affected by the fall in exchange. While their average rupee salary has remained practically the same, its sterling equivalent has fallen from £2,404 in 1875 to £1,374 in 1895. Here, then, was a legitimate field for fair compensation.

Compensation an increase of Salary.

BUT this so-called compensation in the case of officers from 2 to 17 years' standing is, under the circumstances, nothing more nor less than an increase of salary. Taking the average salaries of Indian civilians in the North-West Provinces and converting them into pounds sterling, half at the rate of exchange for the year and the other half at the rate granted by way of compensation, we arrive at the following startling results:—

Officers.	1875.	1895.	Increase of Average Salary.
From 2 to 7 years' standing	£639	£793	£154
,, 8 to 12 ,, ,,	£945	£1,212	£267
,, 13 to 17 ,, ,,	£1,233	£1,688	£455

It is only when we look into the salaries of officers from 18 to 22 years' standing that we find, in spite of compensation, a serious fall in value, the average incomes of these civilians having fallen from £2,404 to £1,841. It may be well to mention that the figures have been compiled from the Civil List for January in each year (men on furlough and serving under other Governments being omitted). In January there are fewer men on furlough than at any other time of the year; while for at least six months in the year the junior men are as a body drawing much higher pay than that upon which the foregoing calculations have been based. Surely facts such as these justify the continuing resentment of the Indian public at the unjust way in which exchange compensation has been awarded to the Indian Civil Service.

British Officers with Indian Regiments.

AN Anglo-Indian correspondent writes:—"General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, in the course of his rattling speech on the Indian Budget night, started a fine 'old hare'—the paucity of British officers with the native regiments of the Indian armies. He made his run gallantly, and one cannot attempt here to follow him over his cross-country course; but, rash though it may seem, it will do no harm to try to break or divert the scent. The Gener l admitted that when on active service several extra British officers are usually added to the fixed number of eight to the regiment, and, as will be seen from Lord George Hamilton's answer to Sir W. Wedderburn's question, earlier in the evening, as to the sanitary condition of the Indian contingent now at Suakin and Tokar, there are in those places seventy European officers—nearly double the number which would normally belong to five native Indian regiments. I am quite aware that this is not a full answer to the gallant member's contention; but I cannot follow that up here. What is necessary to be pointed out—for it is constantly disregarded by those who raise this perennial contention—is that all mention was omitted by Sir Henry of the native Indian *commissioned* officers, the subedars and jemadars (answering to our majors and captains), some twelve to sixteen of whom always form part of each Indian regiment. Mention of this fact puts a very different complexion on the present organisation of the native Indian armies. Though this explanation may not serve to satisfy the critics of the system—which has

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

now subsisted for nearly thirty years—that organisation was the result of long and anxious consideration by competent military authorities, whose judgment is entitled to at least as much weight as that of any British officer, however gallant and experienced in their periods of Indian service, as is Sir Henry. For instance, the present writer has heard the late Lord Napier of Magdala vindicate this regimental organisation, and not least so on the ground of his well-tried confidence in the modern order of native commissioned officers. 'Robert Napier of the Engineers,' who, though a man of few words, was a thoughtful statesman as well as a soldier, had full experience of the old order in the Sepoy regiments, and he assisted at every step in the modern reorganisation of the Indian native armies since the break-up of the old system at the great revolt. At that time the regular establishment of the two-battalion regiments comprised some forty-five British officers, and we know, too well, how signally that system broke down under the strain of disaffection and mutiny. So that the chronic cry for increase of British officers with Indian Sepoy regiments is not quite so forcible as one might suppose whilst listening to General Havelock-Allan's speech the other night.

The History of the Question.

"THE subject is one full of historical, and, in the proper sense, political interest — to say nothing of financial considerations which must be taken into account. As to the history of the question, I have heard Lord Napier of Magdala say that the above-named large proportion of British officers assigned to the Indian armies was forced on by peremptory orders from the War Office or the Horse Guards in the early part of the present century, and in defiance of strong remonstrances on the part of the Indian Government of that day. Whether the remorseless, horse-leech craving for patronage and promotion had much to do with these ancient 'orders from home,' it would be too curious to enquire now. As partly dealing with the history of this semi-technical question of organisation one may usefully refer to a recent leader in the *Times of India* (Summary, June 12th). The writer is too well informed to 'ignore the subedars and jemadars of our Indian Army.' He says frankly and justly: 'They are an admirable body of men, loyal to the Government they serve, devoted to their regiments and to their duty, brave and zealous. But they are not [individually] the equals of the British officers'—which, as my interpolation indicates, is not the question at issue. Here it may be remarked, in passing, that there is much in the Bombay journalist's article, two months ago, which might have served to answer beforehand Lord Wolseley's unhappy ebullition before the Royal Commission, which, by this time, probably, no one regrets more than does 'Our Only General' himself. One word as to Sir H. Havelock-Allan's illustration drawn from the catastrophe at Maiwand. It may be the fact (though I doubt it) that 'there were only ten British officers between the native regiments engaged.' But, if so, someone at headquarters had 'blundered.' And, at most, that was only one incident in a great disaster for which, so far as I remember, the Intelligence Department or the political officers concerned were chiefly at fault. Though present at the court-martial held on two of the surviving regimental officers, I do not recall that much, if any, stress was laid on that particular defect in organisation."

"Flotsam."

IT would appear that Mr. H. Seton Merriman gave the title "Flotsam" to his book (Longmans & Co.) either under a misapprehension as to the exact meaning of the term, or with a wholly wrong valuation of the character of his hero. Jetsam would be more appropriate. Harry Wylam is a ponderous individual who spends most of his existence in sinking, and ends with the rest of the characters in a picturesque confusion aptly typified by the vignette on the title-page of the book. The story is overweighted, too, by morals. The Duchess propounded to Alice the valuable theory that everything has a moral, and emphasized her opinion with unpleasant persistency. Mr. Merriman does the emphasizing, although he does not avow his principle so unblushingly as the Duchess did. We are not allowed to find out for ourselves what the bearing upon our lives of the history written for our instruction may be. We have special warnings on almost every page, which guide our feet into the way of that peace which results from the sleep of weariness. For surely a novel, even if it be written "with a purpose," ought to be so written as if its author presumed it was to be read by an educated public. And an educated public is apt to resent having instruction forced down its throat according to fixed doses. Provide the material, if you will, and let the patients mix and measure their medicines: they may kill, but they will give more pleasure in the killing. If there is any information for the benefit of mankind contained in a novel, mankind will prefer to discover it in its own way, and draw its own morals. The superfluity of morality accordingly weighs down the book of Mr. Merriman; and, as the characters are all crushed to a dead level of mediocrity, it must be presumed that the weight was too much for them. There is, too, no lifelike presentment of the India of the Company, of the London of fifty years ago, of the Mutiny—only a stage background, before which the characters appear to speak their parts. Wherefore the whole is passing wearisome.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE ALIBAG REVISION SETTLEMENT.

By PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

Under this title there has just been published a collection of letters that appeared during the past two years or thereabouts in the *Times of India* and the *Bombay Gazette* on the subject, together with a variety of supplementary documents. The leading disputant, whose name appears on the title-page of the pamphlet, is Mr. Ramji Lakshman Gharat, a landholder of Avas, in the Alibag Taluka, in the Kolaba district: and his chief opponent, though writing under an assumed name, is believed by Mr. Gharat, on internal evidence of his letters, to be, "if not a survey officer himself, at all events a revenue officer intimately familiar with the taluka, and more especially with the revision work of the survey department in Alibag." Between the two, the questions at issue may be taken to be fully represented. The pamphlet bears to be "a series of letters indicating a departure in the Land Revenue Policy of the Bombay Government as applied to the Konkan districts." The object of the letters was sufficiently important, and it may be stated here in Mr. Gharat's own terms:

"That object was to call the attention of Government, of the Survey Department, and of the public generally, to the fact so notorious throughout the taluka, that the Revision Settlement was not the result of a careful examination of the different classes of soil, classed as 'workas,' 'rabi,' 'rice,' and 'garden,' but that it was a rough-and-ready valuation of them according to a pre-determined anna valuation scale based on the 'general position class.' Not the slightest attempt was ever made to ascertain by personal inspection the yield of lands classed as rabi and garden. This is literally the truth, and I challenge Colonel Godfrey, the settlement officer, to disprove it."

In the raiyatwari system of Bombay, we learn from Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell, "the actual rates selected for each class of soil recognised in each group or circle are empirical rates; they do not pretend to represent rental values or a share in the produce; but the soils are so classified and so accurately valued *relatively* that the rates, assumed to be fair as *maxima*, can be graduated to suit each degree of relative value in the individual field." Now, how are the actual full or maximum rates, "assumed to be fair," practically determined? Mr. B. H. Baden-Powell cites the late Mr. Pedder, "than whom no better authority can be quoted":

"The Bombay method is avowedly an empirical one. When a tract (usually a *táluka*) comes under settlement . . . . its revenue history for the preceding thirty or more years is carefully ascertained and tabulated in figured statements or diagrams. These show a juxtaposition for each year of the series the amount and incidence of the assessment; the remissions or arrears; the ease or difficulty with which the revenue was realised; the rainfall and nature of the seasons; the harvest prices; the extension or decrease of cultivation; and how these particulars are influenced by each other; the effect of any public improvements, such as roads, railways, or canals and markets, on the tract or on parts of it, is estimated; the prices for which land is sold, and the rents for which it is let, are ascertained. Upon a consideration of all these data, the *total* settlement-assessment (of the tract) is ascertained. That amount is then apportioned, pretty much in the same way, on the different villages; and the total assessment of each village is distributed over the assessable fields in accordance with the classification which has determined their relative value. . . .

Mr. Baden-Powell explains further that "it is a rule in Bombay to limit the increase taken, to 33 per cent. on the whole *táluka*, or 66 per cent. on the village total, or 100 per cent. on the single holding, above the last assessment." Further, section 107 of the Revenue Code expressly prohibits the increase of assessment in consequence of any private improvements effected during the currency of the previous settlement.

Very well—on paper. But it is obvious that everything depends (1) on the just fixing of the maximum rate, and (2) on the just classification of the various holdings according to the relative value scale. How is it possible to settle justly the rates for any holding without inspection in case of conversion, or without enquiry as to the cost and effects of the holder's own improvements? In fact, the complaint of Alibag amounts to this: that what the Government give with one hand it takes back with the other. While the Government professes the utmost anxiety not to cripple enterprise by levying revenue on the agriculturists' own improvements, it wrests from them a more than full equivalent by an oppressive use of the theory of "position." Mr. Gharat puts it as follows:

"It is in practice that the greatest deviations from sound principles are perpetrated and permitted without challenge or rebuke. For illustration, I need only point to the entirely new factor in the anna valuation of soils in re-classification work introduced in revision settlements in respect of the superiority which one field is supposed to possess over another in regard to position for the reception and retention of drainage or the advantage of what is called the 'general position' class. This ingenious device carries with it a tremendous power of enhancement, and gets from Government any amount of excess revenue that a settlement officer chooses to secure. It is an engine of powerful efficacy to work with. And yet it gives no trouble to the survey officer. All he has to do is to know the quantity of soil and water annas combined, so that on looking at the table specially prepared by the department for working out the classification annas, he is able to tell you what the 'position class' of any field is. With these two factors of soil and water annas, the settlement officer is able to drive a coach and six through any valuation of a field for 'position class.' He has not to visit the field, but is able to tell you from his easy chair in his office the 'position class' valuation of any field of which the soil and water annas are known."

The device was first applied in the Khandesh re-settlements, not only to soil classification, but also to village grouping; and it was condemned, not only by successive Collectors of Khandesh, but also by the then Superintendent of the Deccan Survey. The Alibag landholders have agitated in all the forms admittedly constitutional. They have had questions put in the Legislative Council, and the answers have been evasive. They have memorialised Government, asking for a representative commission of enquiry. So far, apparently, all in vain. We cannot deal with the arguments advanced in this pamphlet here, because they would be unintelligible without greater detail than our space permits. But we set forth the points of difficulty in Mr. Gharat's words:

"Our first complaint is that the old maximum rate for *workas* lands was four annas per acre, but the Settlement Department have unsettled the entire revision work by having it to mean a four anna valuation, and having *surveyed the workas lands of the taluka* by eye only and not by their actual produce, have enhanced the assessment above 300 per cent., and in places up to 1,200 per cent., *although there are extensive tracts of workas lands which cannot even grow a blade of grass*, far less any remunerative

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

produce, as admitted in Government Resolution No. 4380, dated 17th May, 1894."

If this be indeed so, then undoubtedly it is "a matter to which too much importance cannot be attached."

"A second noticeable point is the change made in the new classification of garden lands from the old 32 to 24-anna scale, the effect of which is to distinctly overclass soil and water factors, though the intention was to nominally confirm the old classification. On the other hand, the fact of the supreme importance of water in garden lands have had no adequate weight given to it."

Mr. Gharat expressly exempts from his censure Mr. E. C. Ozanne, they Survey Commissioner. And in a manner justly; for says Mr. Ozanne, the newly adopted system of assessing garden lands "was the subject of much discussion, and I have accorded my full sanction as I cannot suggest a better method, though personally I do not like confirming the old water assessments, for the water classed was that made available by the enterprise of individuals more energetic than their neighbours. . . But the choice lies between total re-classification and to such system as that adopted, and I think that total re-classification would run a greater chance of taxing improvements" These words essentially contain an admission of injustice, and, more than that, the likelihood of greater official injustice if an attempt were made to do the right thing. It is a grievous commentary on the spirit of officialism.

"The third point is the exclusion of Alibag from the benefit of temporary remissions under Igatpuri Resolution (No. 3457, 4th May, 1885) in cases where the difference between the old and the new assessment is less than 8 annas. This is an instance of manifest injustice to the rayats of Alibag. The Hon. Mr. Nugent admits the exclusion, but excuses himself on the plea that the statements for the talukas of Alibag and Pen were prepared before the orders of Government were passed on the draft rules, and on the assumption that draft rule 2 would be approved, so that the instructions regarding remissions would not be given effect to. But admitting the plea, is it fair, I ask, that the poor and hapless rayats of Alibag should suffer because 'the preparation of new statements would have been a work of much time and trouble?'"

There can be no doubt that there is much substance in Mr. Gharat's contentions, and he even deserves support from his opponent's points. It does seem strange that such a prolonged worry should have been permitted to go on, especially when the causes have met with such strong and varied condemnation from high officials thoroughly conversant with the reality and with the working of the system. Sir George Wingate, the creator of the system, said the last word of sound sense on the subject. "No unnecessary reduction," said Sir George, "can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer from it to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves the inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other, some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finances of the State; and with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance? The line of true policy under such circumstances is not in an attempt to fix assessment at what the land will exactly bear, but in fixing it as far within this limit as the exigencies of the state will permit." It may indeed be pleaded that the exigencies of the State are now cruelly pressing, and that Sir George Wingate did not descry within the circle of his vision a Forward Policy on the Frontiers. The wheel always comes full circle. It is the old story of the effects of Militarism.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA.

By J. Dacosta.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, practising in the High Court of Bengal, has just published two pamphlets on a subject which has deservedly attracted much attention—namely, the practice of the Government of India in vesting its revenue officers with judicial powers, and authorising them to adjudicate in all cases where illegality, injustice, or oppression is charged against themselves or their subordinates. The practice is calculated, by facilitating the enforcement of claims illegally asssessed, to encourage the imposition of illegal and oppressive assessments, and it is apt, moreover, to demoralise the Executive officers who are vested with quasi-arbitrary powers, by the temptation it offers to use those powers in improper ways.

One of Mr. Ghose's two pamphlets contains opinions expressed by eminent authorities on the system of uniting judicial and executive functions in one officer; and the other contains reports of authenticated cases illustrating the evils engendered by that system. Lord Cornwallis's opinion, as expressed in the preamble to Regulation II. of 1793, incontrovertibly demonstrates, in the following passage, the absolute necessity of separating judicial and executive functions:

"If the regulations for assessing and collecting the public revenue are infringed, the revenue officers themselves must be the aggressors, and it is obvious that individuals, who have been wronged by them in one capacity, can never hope to obtain redress from them in another. . . . . The revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial powers. All financial claims of the public, when disputed under the regulations, must be subjected to the cognisance of Courts of Judicature superintended by judges who, from their official situations and the nature of their trusts, shall not only be wholly uninterested in the result of their decisions, but bound to decide impartially between the public and the proprietors of land, and between the latter and their tenants. The collectors of revenue must not only be deprived of their power of deciding upon their own acts, but rendered amenable for them to the Courts of Judicature, and collect the public dues subject to a personal prosecution for every exaction exceeding the amount which they are authorised to demand on behalf of the public and for every deviation from the regulations prescribed for the collection of it."

The *régime* established under Lord Cornwallis's legislation rapidly produced that extraordinary degree of prosperity which astonished the world, and powerfully aided in the consolidation of British power in India.

"In 1793 public credit was at the lowest ebb, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Government was threatened with hostilities from various powerful native chiefs. Lord Cornwallis saw that the only resource within his reach was to establish credit and to redeem the extensive jungles of the country. This important object could only be effected by giving the country a perpetual assessment." (*James Pattle, senior member of the Revenue Board, who died in Calcutta in* 1845.)

"The Bengal of to-day offers a startling contrast to the Bengal of 1793: the wealth and prosperity of the country have marvellously increased—increased beyond precedent—under the permanent settlement." (*Burdwan Commissioner's Report.* "*Gazette of India*," 20*th October*, 1883.)

This marvellous change was due entirely to the inauguration of a reign of Law where arbitary power had prevailed, and to the security and encouragement which were thus afforded to industrial enterprise and activity. Can any reasonable doubt be entertained that the contrary tendencies of the system denounced by Mr. Ghose will produce results in the contrary direction? In fact, the cases referred to by him clearly show that the prosperity and the popular attachment to British rule, which were so powerfully fostered by Lord Cornwallis's administration, are being undermined by the revival of arbitrary power, and by the illegalities and irregularities which sometimes disfigure the administration of law in India.

No Englishman can read the cases reported by Mr. Ghose without feeling shame and indignation at the violation of the first principles of equity and justice, and the disregard of the dictates of common fairness, which are too often to be traced in British tribunals in our Indian provinces. The danger inseparable from such a state of things must strike all who have friends and relatives, or material interests at stake, in that country.

INDIAN RAILWAY EXPLOITATION.

[FROM AN ANGLO-INDIAN CORRESPONDENT.]

The new boom in Indian railway exploitation which has arisen during the last eighteen months seems to please everybody. And no wonder. England is the mother, father, and grandfather of that imposing resource of modern civilisation—the highway of iron, with its steam-horse fed by the fuel provided for us in geological æons when this planet was without form and void. Do we not do well thus to extol our good fortune as heirs of the ages. But that is only a sentiment, says the cynic; and he proceeds to ask: How long will it last, and what is it all worth relatively to other methods of material development? This latter question, so far as it applies to our Indian empire, is more practical than may at first sight appear. Meantime, iron-masters and coal-owners, backed up by railway engineers and directors with whom "there's nothing like leather," have no misgivings, while financiers eagerly support them; and Whitehall politicians, whose motto is "India must pay," unite in declaring that theirs is the panacea to cure all the ills and privations that India's millions are heirs to.

This "boom" as regards the India railway system may be considered as having reached its acme of demonstration in the House of Commons on the belated Budget night. Then the past and present Indian Secretaries embraced each other, so to speak, with their mutual congratulations on this inspiring theme. For did not Sir Henry Fowler commit himself to the unqualified proposition that "*nothing* could tend to promote prosperity in India *more* than a large railway expenditure"; while Lord George Hamilton evoked lively cheers, even in that dreary atmosphere, with the announcement (as Sir Henry interpreted it) that he had arranged for the expenditure in the current year of Rx. 12,000,000 on new railway construction? This is grand! With our iron-masters and locomotive builders hungering for new markets, with cheap money thirsting for interest, and financiers thirsting for commissions, such a spectacle is enough to induce a belief from our insular standpoint, that we are on the eve of an Anglo-Indian millennium—seeing that, as the jubilant Secretary remarked, "this country practically monopolises the imports (into India) of railway material." Here, in passing, it may be noted as legitimate ground for sober satisfaction that, thanks no doubt partly to Sir Henry Fowler's business qualities, Lord George was able to assure us that the tedious tangle as to terms and forms of railway guarantees to be given by the Indian Government, has at last been overcome and a solution found, which, in the notable instance of the Rothschild Burma Syndicate, results in the sweet simplicity of two-and-a-half per cent.

So much for the shining side of the shield of Indian railway exploitation. Let us glance at the shady side. The Secretary of State had made the broad statement that "the return on railroads is satisfactory;" and in proof of this recited "the percentage net receipts on lines in operation" in the three years 1893-4 to 1895-6 as 5·49, 5·72, and 5·82, respectively. Sir Henry Fowler repeated these statistics with that impressive emphasis which he is wont to bestow on details, and went on to rejoice over the decreed expenditure of twelve millions with that thumping assertion, quoted above, to the effect that a huge outlay on Indian railways is "wise" because it is "successful" and "a great boon to the people of India." Now Lord George, in reciting the percentages of net profits in India, had, in a parenthesis, dropped the fly into the ointment—"independent of exchange." His lordship, not being a commercially minded person, was not to be expected to perceive the enormous significance of this item, though it is a great fact, and by no means one of his "infinitesimal drawbacks." With Sir Henry Fowler the case is different. If anything, he is a man of business, of figures, and understands the dynamics of statistics. Therefore, one has some right to ask, was the former Indian Secretary justified, was it quite frank on his part, during his optimistic pæan on the unlimited "success" and "prosperity" of Indian railway exploitation, to ignore this very substantial drawback? For this factor is of the essence of his case, the financial test of all his argument. As there was no member ready to supply that missing link we must do so now; and this can easily be done from that unduly slighted

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"Explanatory Memorandum,"—copies of which Blue-book served to relieve the monotony of the vacant green benches that evening. Now let my readers glance above at those assertions as to complete success of our Indian railways, and then read from page 15 of that official document, thus: "The result of the railway revenue account is to impose a *considerable burden* on the Government; in 1893-4 the net charge was Rx. 1,535,503, but the subsequent fall in exchange [value of the rupee] has added greatly to the expenditure, as will be seen from the following statement" of total railway receipts and expenditure, which show in the years 1894-5, 5-6, 6-7, net charge—that is, a deficit—of Rx. 2,348,489, 1,783,700, and 2,274,300, or close on a total of eight millions in these four years. I am quite aware of all that can be said as to the indirect and incidental advantages derived from Indian railways; but "finance tries all," and, seeing that in order to secure returns over the long haulages in the great peninsula, traffic rates, both for goods and passengers, have to be kept at the lowest practicable level, it is plain that these boasts as to "success" and "prosperity" of the Indian railway system are, at least, over-confident, and the claim as to the system being remunerative is arithmetically negatived. Therefore, it will be seen that it was scarcely fair to the House and the public that neither of the Indian Secretaries made more than mere passing reference to that "considerable burden" (emphasised above) which the railway system, as it exists at present, imposes on Indian finance and taxpayers. It is vain to try to evade this plain hard fact by saying that the deficit arises because "the expense of paying in England in gold is so heavy," for without British capital these railways could not have been made. There is a better, and, financially, more appropriate plea than that in bar of final judgment; but this pertains to a subsidiary portion of the subject, to which reference may be made later.

The financial and fiscal test of the too often vaunted remunerativeness of our Indian railways is not yet complete. There is in connexion with this subject, as is the case with some other Anglo-Indian assumptions, "a skeleton in the closet," which it suits Indian Secretaries (birds of passage as they are) to forget and ignore; though one may trust that it will not be entirely overlooked by the present Royal Commission, whose work is not merely for the day, or to prove that all is quite serene.

Now as to those—Indian Secretaries and others—who so confidently assure the public that an ever-increasing outlay on railways in India is a panacea for its material and industrial ills, let me invite them to refer to the Railway Administration Report for 1894-5 and take note of paragraph 18, statement No. 5 of the Director-General's elaborate exposition of the whole subject. They will find there the authentic disclosure of "Total losses by the State in working the railway system of India" from its inception in 1854 to the close of 1894. This presents the astounding total of Rx 51,212,406. Of this 30¾ crores are debitable to the Guaranteed railways—though since 1879-80, that does not include the East Indian line then purchased nor four others taken over at later dates. Those millions of purchase money have been added to the general public debt. It should be noted also that of the thirty millions the larger part—that is, twenty-three—had accrued before 1879-80, so that a stiff problem of compound interest arises thereon. It may be mentioned that up to 1872-3 "loss by exchange" is not included in these tables, it having been previously mixed up with the general charge under that head. Let some competent economist and statistician cast up and consider what that amount of arrears debitable to the Indian railway system—long since squeezed out of the public revenues—means in its pressure on the Indian peoples and their resources. It will then be seen how superficial and illusory—one had almost said puerile—were Sir Henry Fowler's bouncing assertions as to the liabilities and assets of India and the lightness of its taxation.

To revert a moment to that "considerable burden" on India now incurred by remitting interest on British capital, it may be noted that in respect of recent years this factor of exchange cuts both ways. Since, say, 1885-6 there has been large "gain by exchange" on that part of railway capital which is spent in India. Every English sovereign so spent on wages, work of engineering superintendence, and all indigenous materials—which may be roughly stated as one-third of the whole capital outlay—has expanded in India to from fifteen to eighteen rupees. This greater productiveness, so to speak, of the British sovereign is a direct set-off to the burden on the earlier railway transactions, and also indirectly affords an appreciable advantage to Indian industry and in public works outlay. From an incidental remark in the Secretary of State's speech the other day it would seem that the India Office is at last able to perceive that even the dark cloud of exchange has some silver lining to it; though on the same occasion Sir Henry Fowler indicated that he has not got beyond the crude, and—as demonstrated so often and in so many quarters—erroneous notion that "the great increase in net Indian expenditure is attributable in the main to the enormous loss sustained on exchange."

As already intimated, one can help the advocates of present and prospective Indian railway extension to some definite answer to that losing result of railway finance which has been demonstrated above. That large debt is in some proportion due to the onerous and peculiarly adverse terms of the original and, to a large extent, still operative contracts with the old guaranteed companies. And what is more to the purpose as an object lesson in practical finance, a very great part of that financial burden is due to the perverse blunder—I had almost said strange stupidity—of the India Office under the Duke of Argyll when the opportunity to supervise these adverse contracts was flung away in the early seventies. At that time the three great railways, the G.I.P., the B.B.C.I., and the Madras lines might have been acquired by the State and brought under its productive financial control. Fortunately the wisdom of that course was subsequently demonstrated by the acquisition of the East India system; but the unpardonable error in the former instances has, roughly speaking, cost the Indian taxpayer a score or so of millions sterling. Compared with this

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

loss which *was* preventible, the present "considerable burden" of exchange—which, as the helpless official doctors all declare, is beyond their power—is a mere bagatelle.

Several important aspects of this large and ill-understood subject remain to be dealt with on some other occasion. Passing reference must, however, be made once more to Sir Henry Fowler's daring proposition that "*nothing* could tend to promote the prosperity of India *more* than a large railway expenditure." I venture to traverse this statement emphatically. Sir Henry, as it were accidentally, mentioned the word "irrigation," which is a productive work without the heavy financial drawbacks, including exchange, set out above. For India, as Sir Charles Trevelyan said long ago, and as Sir Arthur Cotton has demonstrated beyond cavil, "water is gold." Speaking of water storage and conservancy as a whole, and including inland navigation as well as irrigation, it can be shown that the beneficent agency of that "boon to the people of India" would, million for million, "promote prosperity" by twice or three times the extent that can ever be attained by iron roads.

LORD WOLSELEY AND THE BRITISH AND INDIAN ARMIES.

[BY AN INDEPENDENT POLITICIAN.]

Lord Wolseley has missed a magnificent opportunity. From his position as Commander-in-Chief he could have made a deliverance that would have settled a good many questions in which India and England are interested. Above the suspicion of party bias and preferences, he was just the man to have been bold, honest, and statesmanlike. Many of us long for the appearance of such a clear-headed and brave-hearted man, who cannot be suspected of trying to win votes, or to trim his speech to party exigencies, or to look at Indian questions from the point of view of this year's or next year's Budget. A generous and discriminating Imperialist could have put English politicians right, and have soothed and satisfied the minds of the Indian people. A few months ago, I should have said that Lord Wolseley was such a man, that a sense of his position would have restrained him from jerking out opinions, as he formerly did when relations were strained between England and Ireland, and that he would have been glad of an opportunity of soaring into those still regions where the intellectual vision is sweeping and undisturbed by haze or by refractions.

I must confess that I am greatly disappointed. The evidence Lord Wolseley gave to the Royal Commission on the Military and Civil Expenditure of India, Wednesday, July 29, was one long series of surprises, as startling to read as it was painful to the majority of the members of the Commission to hear. The spirit which animated him throughout was the reverse of what one had a right to expect. The sagacious Commander-in-Chief was invisible, and in his place there was an extremely different being. The prudence, the judgment, the *aplomb* I associate with the office, and with Lord Wolseley when he is at his best, were entirely absent, and in their place was a mocking spirit, an acid sarcasm, a determination to give offence, to provoke the Commission to anger, to show his lordly sense of superiority to members of Parliament, ex-members, and champions of India, that was saddening, patent, and even humiliating. From first to last, Lord Wolseley seems to have made up his mind to be startling, offensive, and *bizarre*. He said the things he was not expected to say, and every question drew from him something more extraordinary. The first Lord Lytton, in his *Pelham*, describes Sir Henry Millington, a padded old gentleman, as being restless, erect, unwilling to settle anywhere. "The fact was, that poor Sir Henry was not that evening *made* to sit down; he had only his *standing up* coat on." When giving evidence on the occasion referred to, Lord Wolseley was in a like position. He was made up to be extravagant, to shock the Commission, to disturb common notions, to turn everything topsy-turvey. His evidence, as a whole, goes beyond the most extreme views held by any section of financiers, politicians, or military men.

A very little examination will substantiate these points. There is no party in this country—at least, I have never met with any sample of the class—which maintains the extraordinary proposition that he laid down when he said: "I think India should pay everything connected with the army." Mr. Buchanan put this question to Lord Wolseley, and he answered it in the way I have already described, that is, in an irritating fashion. "Should India pay every farthing of military expense?" There was room, in answering, for some prudent modification of the naked proposition already quoted. But Lord Wolseley dashed in with one of his daring and petulant answers, saying, "Yes, and the navy, too." It is difficult to believe he was serious, but the matter was too grave for a mess room joke, or a stage retort. The member of Parliament who should venture to maintain that India ought to pay for our army and our navy would be treated to that burst of laughter which is itself a solvent criticism. A Commander-in-Chief of the British army, who allows himself to dream of getting India to pay for the British army and navy, is less reasonable than a native Indian dreamer who sees a chance of Great Britain defraying the whole cost of the Indian army because it is essential to the maintenance of the British Empire in India. The Commissioners he addressed were seeking a balance, a fair adjustment, the reconciliation of Indian and Imperial interests. Lord Wolseley kicked over everything impetuously, and said, "Let India pay for all." Perhaps he had seen that whimsical inn in Yorkshire, called the "Four alls" and the descriptive lines:

> "The Queen governs all,
> The Parson prays for all
> The Soldier fights for all,
> The Farmer pays for all."

There are no politicians who hold the curious belief that England exists to maintain India in existence, though the duty of maintenance is admitted. It is a poor conception of Great Britain, which is something better than a reserve of men

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and money for the Empire of India. The speeches and writings of the Indian journalists who trouble Lord George Hamilton's repose of mind may be searched in vain for any such theory. If they put their extravagant theories into words, they would be more disposed to say "the mischief of the situation lies in England holding the very contrary view, in thinking herself everything and India nothing."

Lord Wolseley's view of the British army as a mere Indian reserve, and as suffering because it is so, is another example of his capricious views. "The whole English Army that we maintain in England is a reserve to be sent to India whenever she requires, for which reserve India pays nothing." It is this plausible theory which accounts for the financial declaration already mentioned. No doubt the matter can be regarded in this way. There was a touch of the real Commander-in-Chief in the statement, because he was conceiving a series of events which might call for great exertions on England's part. But I cannot regard the reasoning as clear. It assumes, to begin with, a co-equal bargain between England and India, which is purely imaginary. There is no defensive treaty in existence. England does not maintain India purely in the interests of India, as this reserve and payment theory implies, but in her own interests quite as much—to put no strain on the words—as in the interests of India. The requirement implied is not an independent requirement. The Indian people would not say, "We want more troops." It would be the English people who would say, "You must have more troops." The fiction of an independent requesting authority in Calcutta, able to subordinate British to Indian interests, and to order troops from England, is manifest the moment we look at it. With the transformation of a supposed fact into a fiction, we must alter Lord Wolseley's declaration into something like this:—"The whole of the British army might have to be sent to India, in an emergency, to maintain its position as a great British dependency, if the British Government thought it advisable. To ask India to go on paying for the whole of the British army, as a Reserve, in view of such a great emergency, whilst it was used by the British Government as it thought fit, at other times, in Egypt or elsewhere, would be financially unsound. The authority which pays for the Reserve must always be in command of it. India, *qud* India, has no command over the Reserve, and therefore contributes nothing to its maintenance."

Hardly less open to question is the assertion that having to recruit men to send to India augments our military difficulties at home. The argument advanced on this point is curiously two-edged. We enlist 16,000 men for Indian service every year. We should not want this number were India able to maintain her position without British troops. Hence, Lord Wolseley argues, we have a difficulty in recruiting the other 30,000 or 40,000 men we need. He then went on to say "we should have a better set of recruits" if there were no annual drafts for India. How this would be he left unexplained, and then he said, "We could always raise troops in England, but not in India." What, then, becomes of the difficulty of recruiting, one way or the other? If we send our best recruits to India, his remarks about them being likely to prove "a great nuisance in case of emergency at home" are inexplicable; whereas, if we send our worst recruits to India, the best stay at home, and the result is satisfactory from that point of view. But I am not convinced that there are any real recruiting difficulties, that service in India is unpopular, or that the 40,000 men we need every year would be better men if we had no Indian Empire to maintain.

Lord Wolseley went on to make two statements which cannot be suffered to pass unchallenged. The first was that "the younger soldiers were invalided in less proportion than the older ones." Now, the great scourge of the British soldier in India is enteric fever, and Mr. T. A. Percy Marsh, in the *Westminster Review* for August, examining this special question, shows that there are 5·01 per cent. of cases of death from enteric fever in the first and second year of a British soldier in India, 1·33 in the third and fourth and, when over ten years can be recorded, none at all. In 1893, as the Government returns show, the deaths of the whole British army in India were 12·61 per cent. so that 5·01 per cent. of the young recruits, or nearly one half, die of enteric fever in the first and second year of service. The seasoned soldier becomes insured to the contagium of typhoid, if he may suffer from other ailments. The second assertion is that "after the soldier had been eight years in India the sooner he was got rid of in the interests of India the better." The great battles in India were won by men "between 21 and 30." The experience of others shows that our best officers in India are men who have been more than eight years in India; that the rank and file of this record have been equally good; that they won big battles; and that in the old Company's days seven-tenths of the men were over this period of service. But it is hardly necessary to labour either point.

Lord Wolseley's theory that the whole of the British army is maintained as a reserve "to be sent to India whenever she requires," drew from one of the Commissioners, Mr. Caine, the very natural query, "Surely the Indian army is quite as much a reserve force for our emergencies." The remark excited the gallant witness to one of his most extraordinary demonstrations. He quickly retorted, "We should not like to put our Indian troops in front of European soldiers," adding, "I should not like to fight France or Germany or any other army with Indian troops." Fortunately, we possess a less tricksical and snappish deliverance from the same witness. Writing in the *North American Review* for July, 1878, Lord Wolseley said, "The Sepoy possesses many of the highest military virtues." The Queen's jewels would be safer under "a Sepoy guard or a Sepoy sentry, than if committed to the care of European soldiers." Now, as to meeting the soldiers of another army, here is a significant passage:—

"Since the invasion of Russia by Napoleon, we have been accustomed to hear a good deal of Cossack troops, and of the advantages possessed by an army well-provided with them. We saw them in the Crimea, and *all who know our Indian cavalry infinitely prefer the latter*. They are far more intelligent, are better armed, and in every way better men, mounted on much better horses. Should we ever be engaged in any great

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

European war, we could easily send 10,000 of them from India, which, added to the 6,000 British sabres we could put in the field, would form a very imposing cavalry force."

Here is the contingency he dealt with, presented by himself, from an earlier deliverance. The Indian cavalry has improved since 1878, it has had more service, and it is now probably equal to any there is in Europe. The change of opinion on Lord Wolseley's part is inexplicable. The second judgment, when contrasted with the first, compels me to think that the former was delivered in a pet. It was mere headiness. He wanted to extinguish Mr. Caine, to fly another eccentricity in the air, and he stopped at nothing.

I turn now to the question of infantry. Here, again, we can appeal to the calm writer from the petulant witness. He praised the native Infantry in 1878, as well as the native cavalry. "The native infantry we could draw from India would be practically unlimited." Others beside himself thought so then, if opinions are modified now. The quotation proceeds:—"No European troops are such good marchers, and all who have learned, from personal experience with them in action" (Lord Roberts would endorse this, from a further and later experience than Lord Wolseley's) "to appreciate their fighting value, will agree with me in thinking that our recent discovery of how willing, nay anxious, our Indian army is to fight in this hemisphere, *will enable England to re-occupy the military position she held in the estimation of the world at the beginning of the century.*" Here we have Lord Wolseley, after the battles between Germany and France, regarding our Indian army as the reserve of the British army, as enabling us to hold our position amidst European conflicts. I am glad to be able to cite another authority on this point, Sir John Strachey wrote, in 1888, (*India*, p. 64)

"But it would be difficult to find in any country finer fighting material than that furnished by Guikhas, Sikhs, and Pathans, and there is hardly any practical limit to the number of excellent troops that, in case of necessity, we could at short notice raise from the martial races of northern India. At the present time there are probably not less than 50,000 to 60,000 men in the native army equal to the troops of any European State, and fit to take their places in battle by the side of British soldiers."

It is unnecessary to dwell on the services our native Indian soldiers have rendered in Afghanistan, in Egypt, in Burma, in Chitral, and elsewhere. Lord Wolseley, in his pique, forgot all about them. He forgot what the Bengal army did in the Mutiny. It is true he has since, under some kind of pressure, issued a *communique*, in which he states that "the Commander-in-Chief entertains the highest opinion of the fighting qualities and efficiency of the Indian army," and that he refers to his 1878 opinion of the Indian cavalry. But, in his final sentence, he harks back to his evidence before the Commission, saying, that "for the purposes for which it exists" (is for purely Indian defence!) "the Indian army is as perfect as it can be." This correction amounts to little. It does not remove the unpleasant impression that all the time he was giving his evidence he was sneering at Indian officers of the British army who, he said, "knew very little of the organisation of the Imperial army all over the world;" and that he was especially comparing himself in private, with Lord Roberts, to the detriment of the latter. It was a most unfortunate exhibition of a narrow and pettish spirit. It was a defiance of general opinion, of experience, and of Imperial courtesy. In fact, nothing in the history of our connection with India has ever been said more calculated to give offence, to wound the spirits of brave men, to excite the pleasure of our enemies, or to weaken the bonds of brotherhood and affection which have been growing and strengthening between the British and the Indian armies, the people who tenderly call Victoria "Queen," and the people who joyfully salute her as "Empress."

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR REVISION.

By A. NUNDY.

Mr. Justice Prinsep, whose full term as one of the judges of the High Court of Bengal has just expired, has been specially retained by the Government of India to revise the Civil and Criminal Procedure Codes which were passed in 1882, and have, since that year, been the subject of several amending Acts. There are some matters in respect of which there have been conflicting decisions by the various High Courts in India, others in respect of which, owing to the loose wording of the sections, it has been found impossible to give effect to the intentions of the Legislature. In some instances, moreover, the law as it now stands needs alteration, on the ground of its operating unfairly or harshly against one of the parties to a suit.

In the last-mentioned class may be included the law relating to the execution of decrees in cases of restitution of conjugal rights. When the British Government took into its own hands the responsibility for administering justice in the newly annexed territories, it publicly announced that in all questions regarding succession, inheritance, marriage or caste, or any religious usage or institution, the Muhammadan law, in cases where the parties were Muhammadans, and the Hindu law, in cases where the parties were Hindus, should form the rule of decision; and in the absence of such law the Court would be guided by considerations of justice, equity, and good conscience. This declaration was solemnly confirmed by provisions which are to be found in various enactments: in Regulation IV. of 1793, sec. 15, so far as the Mofussil was concerned, and in the several statutes passed in the reign of George III. constituting the Supreme Courts so far as related to the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, the said provisions being reaffirmed in the Letters Patent granted to these Courts. Though still professing to be guided by these principles, as a matter of fact the British Government has departed considerably from the lines originally laid down. The existing law relating to the restitution of conjugal rights furnishes a notable case in point.

The law as it stands at present is to be found in sec. 260 of the Civil Procedure Code, and is as follows:

"When the party against whom a decree for the specific

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

performance of a contract, or for restitution of conjugal rights . . . . has been made, has had an opportunity of obeying the decree or injunction, and has wilfully failed to obey it, the decree may be enforced by his imprisonment or by the attachment of his property, or by both."

It is assumed that any of her Majesty's Indian subjects can institute a suit for restitution of conjugal rights, and the penalty for non-performance of a decree in such a case is laid down to be imprisonment, etc. But it is a curious fact that before 1877 no positive provision with regard to this matter can be found in any legislative enactment. It seems as if the Legislature was afraid of rousing the susceptibilities of Hindus and Muhammadans by dealing with questions connected with their marriage law, with which (amongst other subjects) the Government professed, as it still professes, that it had no desire to interfere. But, most opportunely for the Legislature, the Courts of Justice, and notably the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, came to its aid, and cleared the way for the introduction of the present stringent provisions, which are a blot on the Indian statute law.

The first case decided by the Privy Council was that of *Ardasir Cursetji v. Pirozbyi* (6 M.I.A. 348), where it was held that

"A suit for the restitution of conjugal rights (which is strictly an ecclsiastical proceeding) cannot, consistently with the principles and rules of ecclesiastical law, be applied to parties who are Parsis—*i.e.*, non-Christians, and therefore the Bombay High Court, in the exercise of its ecclesiastical jurisdiction, had no power to entertain such a suit."

But the judgment added these significant remarks:

"The Civil Courts in India can bend their administration of justice to the laws of the various suitors who seek their aid. They must have some laws and customs which provide certain remedies, and these remedies the Civil Court might administer."

The Privy Council thus gave an implied sanction to the Civil Courts in India to entertain such suits, and to exercise a certain latitude in ascertaining what were the laws and customs of each community which would justify the exercise of such jurisdiction. This decision was followed in 1867 by what is known as the *Shumsulnissa Begum Case* (11 Moore, I. A., 551), which was an appeal from the judgment of the High Court of Bengal, refusing to exercise jurisdiction in a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights where the parties were Muhammadans. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council held that

"A Mussulman husband may institute a suit in the Civil Courts of India for a declaration of his right to the possession of his wife, and for a sentence that she return to cohabitation; and that suit must be determined according to the principles of Muhammadan law. . . . Disobedience to the order of the Court directing the wife to return to cohabitation would seem to fall within the 200th section of the Civil Procedure Code and to be enforceable only by imprisonment, or attachment of property, or both."

On the strength of these two authorities suits for the restitution of conjugal rights began to be instituted in the ordinary course in the Civil Courts of India, and in 1877 the Legislature became emboldened to put on the Statute Book the provision quoted above, which removed all doubts as to the power of the Civil Courts to try such suits.

But it would seem that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was not free from inconsistency. For though in the case of *Ardasir Cursetji v. Pirozbyi* it ruled that the High Court of Bombay had no power in the exercise of its Ecclesiastical jurisdiction to entertain a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights where the parties were non-Christians, yet it adjudged to the Indian Civil Courts the duty of redressing a wrong which had been declared as such only by the Ecclesiastical Law of England, and not by the Civil Law either of England or of any other country. In England a suit for restitution of conjugal rights was not part of the English Common Law or English Equity, but was peculiar to the Ecclesiastical Courts. It is not to be found in the American law. "Closely as the Americans," says Mr. Justice Melhill, "have in general followed the English law, they have deliberately excluded from their system the suit for the restitution of conjugal rights." The French law "has no process for compelling cohabitation of discordant couples." The Scotch enjoin "adherence," but not "reunion." The Muhammadans look upon marriage as a purely civil contract. The obligations which arise after marriage are laid down in detail. To be consistent, when the Civil Courts order a wife to resume cohabitation, they ought to be prepared to enforce these obligations. There is, in truth, absolutely nothing in the spirit or the general principles of Muhammadan law to support the inference that it contemplated that a suit by one party could be brought against another for the restitution of conjugal rights. The decision of the High Court of Bengal in the *Shumsulnissa Case* was, therefore, in strict accordance with Muhammadan law when it held that the proper remedy, if there is one, is the denial of maintenance to a rebellious wife, or at most a suit for damages. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, acting under the influence of the Ecclesiastical law of England, held otherwise, though the reasoning of their Lordships is curious. They could cite no express authority on the point, because none existed. But they argued that the Muhammadan law strongly favoured the husband—he can dissolve the marriage tie at his will, and whilst the marriage subsists the husband's power is considerable—and therefore that the husband had a right to sue his wife to resume cohabitation. But how if a Muhammadan wife were the plaintiff in a suit for restitution of conjugal rights? This reasoning would scarcely hold good in her case. It would in fact go to show that she was not entitled to a privilege accorded to her husband. But such a result the Judicial Committee of course never for a moment contemplated.

With the Hindus marriage is a religious ordinance. The duties are religious, and enforced by religious machinery. The only case contemplated by law is that of a wife deserting her husband, and the only penalty laid down is a fine to the king. But no provision is made that the king shall order her to go back to her husband, nor do any of the treatises on Hindu law contemplate or sanction proceedings in Court to force a wife to resume cohabitation.

It is therefore evident that the Civil Courts in India are acting in direct contravention of Hindu and Muhammadan law when they entertain suits by members of these religions for the restitution of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

conjugal rights, and moreover that the Government is not, as it undertook to be, guided in cases relating to marriage by the laws which appertain to these communities. True, it might be urged that the Courts are influenced by considerations of equity and good conscience, or in other words by principles of natural justice. But it would be as well to drop the legal fiction that the Courts base their decisions upon the precepts to be found in Hindu or Muhammadan jurisprudence. The matter resolves itself into the question whether it is desirable, for the ends of justice, that the Civil Courts should have jurisdiction to try these matrimonial cases? And although, on the one hand, it may be conceded that in certain cases it is desirable, on the other hand it ought to be admitted that these proceedings are really the shadow of similar proceedings which had their origin in the Ecclesiastical Courts of England. We should then have some clear notion as to what the law is which ought to govern such cases.

Now, if the principles of ecclesiastical law are to be applied at all, they ought to be applied in their integrity. No Court in England would for a moment countenance the idea of giving a decree for the restitution of conjugal rights unless it was proved that the party complained against had of his, or her, free will consented to the solemnisation of the marriage. Yet what do we find in India?—a girl married in tender years to a man with whom she has never lived as his wife, being ordered by the Civil Courts to surrender herself to him, stranger though he really is, and although she may have the most cordial dislike for him. In the famous Rukhmabai case, had not the matter been otherwise settled, it was possible for the Bombay High Court to pass such an order. And what if the order had been disobeyed? The defendant would have been liable under section 260 of the Civil Procedure Code to be imprisoned in the common gaol.

When the Rukhmabai case was being heard by the Bombay High Court, the feelings of the educated classes in India were intensely roused against this iniquitous provision in the Civil Procedure Code, and so great was the agitation that Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, took notice of it, and in 1890 publicly admitted the need of amending a law which he called "an excrescence grafted from an extraneous jurisprudence." An opportunity soon presented itself to the Government when the Bill for amending certain sections in the Civil Procedure Code was before the Council. A clause modifying the law so far as to make it a matter of discretion for the Court to enforce, or not to enforce, such a decree by imprisonment, was introduced. The Hindu judges of the several High Courts pronounced in favour of this amendment. The Central Muhammadan Association of Bengal was equally desirous of relaxing the rigour of the law, and there was almost a consensus of opinion so far as the educated classes were concerned. Yet the Select Committee threw out the clause on the ground that they were unwilling to rouse the susceptibilities of the people, who, it was said, were not yet ripe for such a change in the law—as if the existing law were a cherished heirloom of the Hindus and Muhammadans which they had inherited from their ancestors, instead of its being a palpable importation from the ecclesiastical law of England!

Naturally, a law so obnoxious is seldom enforced. Happily there are not many cases in which application is made for punishing by imprisonment a recusant wife. The instincts of the people revolt against measures not sanctioned by their own laws. But a few months ago a case of this kind arose in Karachi, which the presiding judge disposed of in a curious way. He remarked—

"There is something extremely repugnant to one's ideas of propriety, indeed, of mere decency, in insisting on a woman's returning to a man whom she hates, and of imprisoning her like a criminal if she does not go back to him in accordance with the Court's decree; and in the famous case of Rukhmabai, though a decree was given to her husband, I do not think that matters were pushed so far as imprisoning her for disobedience to the decree."

Accordingly the judge got over the difficulty by ruling that the word "may" in Sec. 260 gave him a discretionary power either to order imprisonment or not to a party disobeying the order to resume cohabitation.

In conclusion, it would appear to be established that suits for the restitution of conjugal rights are foreign to the instincts of the people of India; that they have their basis in, and have been imported from, the Ecclesiastical Courts of England; that they have been extended to cases not contemplated by the Ecclesiastical Courts of England, *i.e.*, to persons who were not consenting parties to the marriage tie; and that imprisonment for disobedience to a decree in such cases is repugnant to the feelings of the people. Mr. Justice Prinsep and Mr. Chalmers, the Legal Member of Council, who are now engaged in revising the Civil Procedure Code, would do well to take this matter into their serious consideration, and it is earnestly hoped that they will embody in the new Bill provisions, which (*a*) will leave it to the discretion of the Courts to give or to withhold a decree against persons whose marriage was contracted when they were unable to give their free consent to such marriage, and (*b*) will abolish altogether the existing power to enforce such a decree by imprisonment.

THE DEBATE ON THE "INDIAN BUDGET."

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

REVOLT AGAINST OFFICIAL OPTIMISM.

We reproduce below extracts from the English press referring to the recent debate on the Indian Budget, as it is rather inaccurately termed. It would be easy, if space permitted, to increase the number of favourable—and, of course, of unfavourable—opinions. On the whole, it may be said, without rashness, that signs are not wanting to show that in British public opinion there is a growing revolt against official optimism in Indian affairs.

"TAXATION HAS REACHED THE LIMITS OF SAFETY."—*Times.*

"It is well to realise the exertions which India has made in order to convert deficit into surplus. The present and the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

past Secretary of State showed themselves alive to this aspect of the case. It is not only a question of new import duties on the middle classes and of a salt tax raised to a very heavy rate upon the poor, it is also a question of local cesses and rates which do not enter into Imperial finance, and which are therefore seldom heard of in Parliament, but which sometimes press with greater severity than the Imperial taxes on the people. The important State paper by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, to which we lately called attention, forms the true complement to Thursday evening's debate. India is solvent. In regard to a very large part of her public debt she can show, as Sir Henry Fowler pointed out, ample assets in the shape of railways and reproductive works. In return for her annual expenditure she enjoys a peace and prosperity never known under a previous rule. Yet these facts should not make us forget that she has to maintain her solvency, and to pay for her peace and prosperity by a taxation which her Imperial and provincial financiers alike declare to have reached the limits of safety. As her resources develop those limits will in time extend. The difficulty is to prevent the increase of Indian public burdens from exceeding the rate of Indian industrial progress."

"A DISMAL FARCE."—*Daily News.*

"Before this eventful Session comes to an end, and the weary supporters of the strongest Government of modern times can depart to the moors, the Indian Budget has had to be squeezed in somehow. But who cares about it? Not, it would seem, the Legislative Council of India, who polished it off last March in something less than two sittings, without a division and without amendment. Not, we imagine, the House of Commons, where Sir J. Westland's handiwork served to empty the benches at the eleventh hour of an expiring Session. Yet somebody, one cannot help thinking, must be interested in a financial statement which, among other trifles, provides for an expenditure of more than nine hundred and seventy millions of rupees. It is usual, no doubt, for Englishmen to render these big totals less formidable to the eye and the ear by writing and talking in terms of "Rx." ——, which, in happy days gone by, were practically the equivalent of a £. But the Indian rayat does not count like that. People are less glib about "tens of rupees" in a country where the average income is estimated, not without authority, at something under twenty-five rupees a year. Perhaps one of the reasons why the House of Commons finds the annual discussion on the Indian Budget such a dismal farce is that it does not, in any true sense, discuss the Budget at all. . . . . When it is said that the Indian Budget comes before the House of Commons, all that is meant—or, at all events, all that is true—is that the House of Commons is invited to accept the totals shown in the closed accounts for the year before last."

"EXCHANGE CANNOT BE MADE THE SCAPEGOAT."—*Daily Chronicle.*

"Omitting minor differences, there are two opposite explanations of the embarrassments of Indian finance. One is that the Government of India is inclined to extravagance, and especially in military matters; the other is that the fall in the exchange value of the rupee is the *fons et origo mali*. It is hardly necessary to say that the former view does not find favour with the Government of India. Now in 1895-6 exchange turned out much better than was expected, and in the current year, 1896-7, there seems every prospect of this good fortune being maintained. In his Budget for 1895-6 the Indian Finance Minister had to make provision for an expenditure of Rx.13,250,000 on exchange, besides large sums for exchange compensation and the sterling pay of the British troops. The revised estimate for 1895-6, and the Budget estimate for 1896-7, show totals well under Rx.12,000,000; while altogether, through the improvement in exchange, there is a lessened expenditure of over Rx.1,500,000 in 1895-6, and of over Rx. 1,750,000 in 1896-7. This time, at any rate, exchange cannot be made the scapegoat. We turn, then, to the expenditure on the army. Omitting exchange, the cost of the army was in 1894-5, Rx. 18,900,000 (about Rx. 400,000 less than in 1893-4); in the Budget for 1895-6 it was estimated at Rx. 19,750,000 (Chitral, Rx. 150,000!); in the revised estimate for 1895-6 it has grown to Rx. 20,750,000 (Chitral, Rx.1,650,000!); and for the current year, with no Chitral expedition to swell the total, it is Rx. 20,300,000. In two years Rx. 1,400,000 has been added to the annual cost of the army, apart from the sum spent on the Chitral expedition."

"ROOM FOR MANY ECONOMIES."—*Manchester Guardian.*

"Lord George Hamilton for some reason or other, felt it necessary to dwell on this embarrassing feature of Indian finance (*sc.* exchange). He repeatedly warned the House that calculations as regards future Budgets must continue to some extent guess-work so long as the Indian Government is liable to such sudden and disasterous falls in the exchange as that which occurred in 1894-5. No doubt there are authorities who will hold that the Secretary of State has exaggerated the influence of this adverse feature in Indian finance, to the neglect of other avoidable drains on the resources of India. He certainly spoke in more eulogistic terms of the system of control over expenditure in India, which he considers to be more efficacious than in this country, than even Indian finance authorities like Sir David Barbour and Sir William Wedderburn have been in the habit of employing; and, without pretending there is no room for improvement in this country, we may take leave to doubt whether, even apart from the policy of military adventure of which the Chitral expedition was an illustration, there is not room for many economies in the administration of Indian without any sacrifice of efficiency. Leaving this question on one side for the present, however, it may be that Lord George Hamilton had his own reasons for specially pressing on the attention of the House last night the disadvantages of a fluctuating exchange."

"THE ENORMOUS INCREASE IN CIVIL AND MILITARY EXPENDITURE."—*Daily Chronicle.*

"The total increase (as compared with 1884-5) in expenditure of Rx. 14,150,000 is made up as follows:—

Collection of Revenue and Civil Services generally	Rx. 7,500,000
Military Services	8,500,000
Increased cost of Government (Exch. Rx.5,600,000)	16,000,000
Debt and Commercial Services (Exch. Rx.4,700,000)	—650,000
Famine Grant and Railway Construction	—1,200,000
Net increase as above	Rx. 14,150,000

"THE FINANCIAL POSITION.

"A fair statement of the improvement or deterioration in the financial position may be arrived at by taking the difference between the sum of the improvements and the sum of the deteriorations in both revenue and expenditure. The account then stands thus:

"IMPROVEMENT.—1884-5—1896-7.

Natural increase in Land and Forest Revenue	Rx. 4,500,000
Natural increase from Taxes	4,750,000
Increase from Tributes	200,000
Increased expenditure under Debt and Commercial Services	650,000
Total Improvement	Rx. 10,100,000

"DETERIORATION.—1884-5—1896-7

Increased Taxation, Land	Rx. 500,000
,, Taxes	6,000,000
Loss of Opium Revenue	1,550,000
Increased cost of Civil Services	7,500,000
,, ,, Military Services ..	8,500,000
Diminished provision against Famine, etc.	1,200,000
Total Deterioration	Rx. 25,250,000
Deduct Improvement	10,100,000
Net Deterioration	Rx. 15,150,000

To this large deterioration in twelve years of Rx. 15,150,000, exchange cannot be properly said to have contributed much more than one-third—namely, Rx. 5,800,000. We must look to the enormous increase in civil and military expenditure if we would find an adequate cause for these tremendous figures."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIAN OPINION ON MILITARY EXPENDITURE.—*Daily News.*

"The surplus was due to an unexpected saving on exchange. But for this windfall, there would have been a deficit. As it is, the Government of India partially restores the Famine Insurance Fund, which had been suspended, and makes Lord George Hamilton's clients in Lancashire a present of five millions of rupees. The present Government also, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have occupied Chitral, regardless of expense and of Lord Elgin's proclamation. Mr. Balfour assured an audience at Glasgow last November that the cost of this operation would be 'absolutely insignificant.' Perhaps he was thinking of the preliminary estimate of 1,500,000 rupees. Sir James Westland, who remarks significantly that 'the financial statement is not the place in which to defend the policy of the expedition or the occupation which has followed it,' shows that it has cost India 672,000 rupees in the accounts of 1894-95, 16,475,000 rupees in the revised estimate of 1895-96, and a further sum of 200,000 rupees in 1896-97. To these amounts have to be added a sterling expenditure of £16,000 and a 'legacy of permanent expenditure in the occupation of Chitral and of its communications,' estimated for 1896-97 at 2,317,000 rupees. Needless to say, this expenditure has been much criticised in India, where educated opinion ascribes the chronic embarrassments of the Government not to loss by exchange, but to overgrown military expenditure."

"INDIAN ACCOUNTS NOT 'IDEALLY PERFECT.'"—*Times.*

"Sir William Wedderburn's amendment illustrates the views of many who think that the salvation of India is to be found in Parliament. His proposal for a Select Committee of the House to review the Indian accounts year by year would unquestionably bring them under a scrutiny more exact than the present Indian Budget debate in Parliament pretends to. But such a scrutiny, if it is to be of value, must be a scrutiny of Indian finance rather than of Indian accounts. We may not quite literally accept Mr. Cohen's certificate that the present system of Indian accounts is "ideally perfect." Yet any one whose business it has been to study the question will agree with him that the Indian accounts are as clear and business-like a statement of the facts as is likely to be obtained. It is certainly a more clear and business-like presentment than a Select Committee of the House could hope to supply. Sir Henry Fowler was justified in protesting against the idea that a mass of figures was thrown on the Table of the House without anything to guide members as to their meaning. It would be more correct to say that every member of the House has had in his possession a clear and detailed explanation of the Indian accounts for many weeks before the Indian Budget debate comes on. It is this circumstance which tends in no small measure to take the vitality out of the debate for many of the most practical members, and to explain the thin attendance at it."

"ALL-DEVOURING MILITARY EXPENDITURE."—*Star.*

"When, therefore, Sir James Westland invites us to rejoice with him over his Budget Estimate, we look at this all-devouring military expenditure, we look at the neglect of education and public works, we observe the declaration of successive Secretaries of State that the union of judicial and executive functions—of judge and detective—in India is only continued because of financial straits, and we reply that it is one thing to govern a country and another thing to balance its books. We look, also, at the famine insurance fund which, after frequent suspension—on one occasion, when 'exchange compensation allowance' was granted by Anglo-Indian officers *to themselves*—is now only partially restored. Yet when the new taxation was imposed to create the fund it was officially stated that 'no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, would tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust.' Sir James Westland, thanks to an unexpected saving on exchange, found himself at the beginning of this year with a little money to the good. How did he employ it? Did he suggest that detectives should no longer act as judges? Did he make a grant for education? Did he reduce the salt tax? Did he remit some part of the oppressive rents exacted by the Government of India? Not a bit of it. At the bidding of Lord George Hamilton he financed the occupation of Chitral, and so rearranged the cotton duties for the benefit of Lancashire as to involve a net loss of Rx. 500,000 per annum to the Indian revenues."

"RECKLESS OFFICIAL OPTIMISM."—*Daily Chronicle.*

"The statement which Lord George Hamilton made to the House yesterday afternoon was more remarkable for what it left out than for what it contained. About three weeks ago, when commenting on the Indian financial statement, we ventured to hint that certain facts worthy of attention would not receive due prominence in the Indian Secretary's Budget speech. We then pointed out that since 1893-94—only three years ago—there has been an increase of expenditure (not counting exchange, that whipping-boy of the Indian Government) of over one and a-half millions, of which more than one million was under the head of "Army"; that half a million had been diverted from the Famine Fund, and that Rx. 2,800,000 of fresh taxation had been imposed. So far as the Army is concerned, if the comparison be made with 1894-5—only two years ago—there has been an increase under this head alone of nearly one and a-half millions, again without exchange. Yesterday we published a detailed analysis of the Indian financial position compared with what it was twelve years ago. That analysis showed in figures beyond the reach of controversy that a very serious deterioration had taken place in Indian finance in recent years. Heavy additional taxation, heavy loss under certain heads of revenue, heavy increase in civil and military expenditure, reduced expenditure on famine insurance —these are notorious matters which no official ingenuity can describe as other than a cumulative worsening of the financial position. In the face of facts such as these, Lord George Hamilton's review of the situation was an extraordinary exhibition of reckless official optimism."

"ANGLO-INDIAN COMPLACENCY."—*Star.*

"It is to be regretted that Lord G. Hamilton—who reversed the ordinary procedure yesterday—was not able to accept Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, for the annual scrutiny of the Indian accounts by the methods, *mutatis mutandis*, which we apply to our own. Mr. Bhownaggree, whose speeches rather unpleasantly indicate a desire to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, called attention to the scandalous union, in one and the same official in India, of the functions of magistrate and constable, judge and detective, court of appeal and public prosecutor. The only avowed pretext for the system is the expensiveness of reforming it. But how does that square with Lord G. Hamilton's words of consolation? Mr. Bhownaggree's position with reference to the India Office and the Tory party suggests, by contrast with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's, a parody of Kipling:—

> Oh! it's 'black man' this, and 'black man' that, and
> 'black man' all the day;
> But it's 'learned friend Bhownaggree,' when he gives
> his pals away.

Lord G. Hamilton propounds the truly remarkable theory that the only standard by which British rule in India may be judged is the standard of the rule which it superseded or which might take its place. Has Anglo-Indian complacency really come to this? Surely there is another standard—the standard of our own conception of duty—of what we owe to ourselves."

"THE MOST SATISFACTORY FOR MANY YEARS."—*St. James's Gazette.*

"The Indian Budget statement last night was the most satisfactory that has been submitted for many years. Revenue is increasing and expenses are being kept well in hand; so that Lord George Hamilton, who is not much of an optimist, was able to state that the last year had been 'a very remarkable' one, and that there were hopes that it marked the commencement of a new financial era. The gross accounts show a surplus of Rx. 1,604,000, and the revised estimates a surplus of Rx. 905,200. Economies have been effected in many quarters, and there is a general advance under most heads of revenue. For the financial year 1896-97 the estimated surplus is Rx. 463,000, in spite of an increase in the famine fund reserve, and some additional expenditure for special purposes on the army. For the first time since 1891 the Indian Secretary is able to show a surplus for each of the three years with which he deals, and, as Lord George said, "What makes the surpluses more satisfactory is the fact that they are honest surpluses and that the total expenditure has been defrayed without a loan."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1896.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S OPTIMISM.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, at the close of the characteristic speech which he delivered on August 13th, on the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts, observed that no Secretary of State had ever performed that duty without being impressed by the immense range of subjects with which he had to deal, and the multiplicity and complexity of the questions on which he was asked to give an opinion. The remark suggests at least two obvious reflections. In the first place, it seems odd that so large and complex a subject should be relegated to a solitary evening in the last week of the Session. In the second place, it is no doubt true that a Secretary of State, having so many subjects to choose from, is tempted to select those which are the easiest—those upon which, with the least expenditure of trouble, there is the greatest opportunity of being plausible. But one of the chief tests of a Minister's fitness for his office consists precisely in the extent to which he overcomes temptations of this kind. The temptation is, of course, all the greater when he knows beforehand that his audience will be meagre and not greatly interested, and that he may count upon the aid of the Front Opposition Bench in denouncing, though not perhaps in demolishing, the objections of independent critics. Lord George Hamilton succumbed to the temptation. If his speech had been prepared for him by the permanent officials at the India Office, if he had accepted purely departmental reports without scrutiny and without question, and if he had contributed to this compost merely a spice of general benevolence and optimism, his speech would not have been very different from what it was. We look, as some members, at any rate, of his audience listened, in vain for any hint of a disposition to regard Indian finance from the point of view of the mass of unrepresented Indian taxpayers—to scrutinise the purposes and the amounts of expenditure with the jealous eye of those who bear the burden of taxation and realise day by day the disadvantages that arise from the neglect of necessary works. To say this is not to question the excellence of Lord George Hamilton's intentions in general. Still less is it to disparage the admitted benefits of British rule in India. The point is that Lord George Hamilton, instead of grappling with the really crucial and fundamental topics, was content with the less exacting task of summarising the accounts from the standpoint of a Treasury official, and obscuring difficulties, dangers, and the force of adverse criticism under a cloak of optimistic rhetoric. Secretaries of State for India are, of course, accustomed, in dealing with Indian finance, to look chiefly at the bright side. But Lord G. Hamilton's optimism was more than usually aggressive and pronounced. He talked of a "remarkable improvement" in the financial condition of India, and of the Indian Government's "remarkable frugality and "vigorous supervision over expenditure." He congratulated the House of Commons upon a series of "honest surpluses." Finally, he contrasted the "infinite benefits" of British rule in India with what he thought fit to describe as its "infinitesimal "drawbacks."

Lord George Hamilton adopted an unusual course in making his financial statement, not in Committee, but on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair. The House, he said, had met for the purpose of discussing Indian finance, while the amendments of which notice had been given were "purely academic "in character." This was an odd pretext for avoiding inconvenience. The House consisted, when Lord George Hamilton rose, of some 22 members, most of whom had come to discuss the amendments. One of the amendments dealt with a matter which was strictly financial, while another dealt with a grievance which, according to two successive Secretaries of State for India, would have been removed but for financial objections. The attention of the House of Commons is seldom, and with difficulty, directed to Indian questions, and it is a serious thing to tamper with the freedom of debate upon the motion to go into Committee. If Lord George Hamilton had been more candid he would have admitted that the purpose of his unusual procedure, as it was also the purpose of the Government in confining the debate to a single day, was to curtail discussion. He began his speech with the usual lamentation over the "unfortunate consequences of erratic exchange." This bogey has ceased to be plausible. Nor will it again become plausible until the Secretary of State meets the contention, which is universally urged in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India, and which, as we show elsewhere, is now widely held in England, that the chronic embarrassments of the Indian Treasury are due, not to loss by exchange, but to the excessive growth of civil and military (especially military) expenditure. The lamentation was this year even more misplaced than usual. Exchange may be erratic. But its consequences, far from being unfortunate on this occasion, are the "honest surpluses" on which Lord George Hamilton dwelt with so much pride. In the financial year 1895-96 the rate of exchange, estimated at 13·09d., was really 13·68d., an increase which, on Lord George Hamilton's own admission, yielded an aggregate improvement of Rx. 1,610,000. As the surplus which is now shown in the Revised Estimates for that year is Rx. 951,400, it does not require the omniscience of an "expert" to perceive that but for the consequences of erratic exchange, there would have been a deficit. Lord G. Hamilton had a good deal to say about the restoration of the Famine Insurance Fund. Sir James Westland himself admits that the restoration is only "partial." Lord G. Hamilton committed another grave inaccuracy when he said that the annual payment to the Famine Insurance Fund was originally fixed at Rx. 1,500,000. If he will refer to Lord Lytton's Minute of March 12th, 1878, he will find that the payment was to be "at the rate of one and a half millions *sterling* per "annum." It is curious that a specialist in exchange should overlook so important a difference. Sir James Westland observed, rather significantly, that the Financial Statement was not the place in which to defend the policy of the Chitral expedition, or the occupation which had followed it. Lord G. Hamilton is clearly of a different opinion. His defence, however, took the form of the paradox that a frontier in High Asia will lead to reduced expenditure. But then the Secretary of State is not required to balance the accounts. That is a duty which belongs to the Finance Minister.

It is interesting to learn that since Lord George Hamilton has been at the India Office he has "made "a point" of reading translations of Indian newspapers. Translations are not always so accurate as might be desired. Lord G. Hamilton complains of the "acerbity" of Indian newspapers. They indulge —*O tempora, O mores!*—in "general depreciation "of our rule." Hence the impiety of "attaching "undue importance to the infinitestimal drawbacks "of our rule and ignoring its infinite benefits." Lord G. Hamilton is not the first critic who has denounced, and excited Tory cheers by denouncing, the native press of India. The late Sir George Chesney made the same mistake—and was corrected for it by Sir Richard Garth, who, like Lord George Hamilton, is a Tory, but, unlike Lord George Hamilton, has been Chief Justice of Bengal. "I can only say," Sir Richard Garth wrote, "that I read native papers "myself week after week, and never see anything "there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty "or disrespect to British rule. What I do find there, "and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-"deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many "of the Government officials. I am afraid this is "exactly what the Government would wish to re-"press. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian "people but of the Courts of Justice." If Indian politicians and journalists seem to Lord George Hamilton to lay too much stress upon grievances, may not one reason conceivably be that those who are set in authority over India lay too little stress upon them? May not a Secretary of State conceivably encourage criticism and objection when his annual statement is, from end to end, little else than a series of superficial congratulations. To talk about remarkable improvements, and honest surpluses, and the Government's frugality, as if that were the whole of the matter when, as Lord G. Hamilton knows, the taxes of India are being swallowed up in "harum-scarum" military enterprises while, as he admits, there are no "taxable "resources that are not now in operation," is—to put the thing on no higher ground—in the last degree imprudent. The gross expenditure for which provision is made in the Budget Estimate, 1896-97, amounts to Rx. 97,157,600. Of this amount Rx. 11,156,900 are swallowed up by "direct de-"mands on the revenue"—in other words, by charges in respect of collection—Rx. 15,396,500 are absorbed by "salaries and expenses of civil depart-"ments," and Rx. 25,583,900 are set down for "Army Services," which, of course, by no means represent the total military expenditure. Meantime education is neglected, public works are starved, enhancements of land revenue have created widespread discontent, and the hateful salt-tax, as Lord G. Hamilton says, and as even Sir H. Fowler is prepared to admit, "cannot be put higher, because it is "higher now than one could wish it to be." The educated classes in India might be disposed to dwell less vehemently upon matters like these if the India Office and the Government of India were less inclined to ignore them or to gloss them over. It is official optimism that tinges Indian discontent with the bitterness of despair. It is doubtless easy to maintain, as Lord G. Hamilton does, that British rule in India is better than the rule which it superseded or the rule which might take its place. That is not the point, and we are very sure that public opinion in the United Kingdom would hold, in spite of Lord G. Hamilton, that that is not the standard. The standard is what might be done, and what, therefore, ought to be done. For British conceptions of duty and self-respect we need not go to departmental apologists. But even departmental apologists may be brought to see the unwisdom of burying their heads in the sand.

WANTED: EFFECTIVE SCRUTINY.

SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN'S amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts was defeated by a majority of 80 votes (110—30). The proposal which it made was, as its author said, both simple and moderate. Its purpose was merely to secure the more effectual discharge by the House of Commons of its existing duty in respect of Indian finance. The particular

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

means which it suggested towards this end was the appointment of a Select Committee to examine and report upon the East India Accounts year by year. There is already a Standing Committee for the regular examination of the Public Accounts of the United Kingdom. What Sir W. Wedderburn asked was that the advantages of such an enquiry might, *mutatis mutandis*, be extended to India. The thirty members who supported the proposal in the division-lobby included Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Philip Stanhope, Mr. T. M. Healy, and Mr. Michael Davitt. The majority against it included Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Gerald Balfour, and those distinguished Anglo-Indian "experts", Mr. Joseph and Mr. Austen Chamberlain. It was said of the Duke of Argyll a few years ago that he had developed into a thorough-going Tory, and that his feudal instincts were almost as strong as Mr. Chamberlain's. Mr. Chamberlain's bureaucratic instincts are now almost as strong as Sir Henry Fowler's. The majority and the minority offer to the student of that most fascinating of all movements, the course of events, many points of contrast. One of them is that most of the thirty members who voted with Sir W. Wedderburn had heard the debate, while nearly all the 110 supporters who rallied round Lord George Hamilton were summoned by the division-bell from the terrace, the smoking-room, the library, and those private rooms where, beyond these voices, there is rest for the jaded Minister. Perhaps, indeed, it would be more accurate to say that these automatic voters, who so eloquently and so frequently deprecate the introduction of party bias into Indian debates, rallied round Sir Henry Fowler. For it was he, and not Lord George Hamilton, who replied, or made a pretence of replying, to Sir W. Wedderburn. Archbishop Magee said of John Bright that he divided his opponents into knaves and fools, with the third class of bishops, who united the characteristics of both the others. It may be said, without much fear of contradiction, that the spirit of John Bright is not the spirit of Sir Henry Fowler. If there is one thing which gives more evident delight to the member for Wolverhampton than adoring a political opponent, it is denouncing a political ally. This amiable characteristic has been so often displayed by its owner that the House of Commons, and the public, are now accustomed to it. But it is a pity that Sir Henry Fowler cannot gratify his disposition, and fulfil his purposes, without flagrantly misinterpreting the matter under discussion. His speech in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn was, from first to last, irrelevant because it was based upon a series of misconstructions.

No unprejudiced observer believes that the amount of time and attention which the House of Commons now bestows upon the Indian Accounts is adequate. The annual debates upon the Indian Budget, as it is termed, is described in the House as a nuisance and, out of it, as a combination of scandal and farce. Sir H. Fowler's remark that the House of Commons is never more crowded than when questions arise which affect the interests of India is, in the first place, inaccurate. True, there was a full House in February of last year to hear the debate, and his own sonorous eloquence, on the cotton duties. But it is notorious that, so far as the House of Commons was concerned, the paramount question on that occasion was not whether the Government of India would have its way, but whether Lancashire would triumph and the Government at home suffer a defeat. Debates have taken place since then upon the cotton duties, the retention of Chitral, and the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar. Did not these questions, to mention no others, affect the interests of India? And will Sir Henry Fowler maintain that on these occasions the House of Commons was crowded? But even if his remark had been accurate, it would still have been irrelevant. The purpose of Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment was to obtain a more systematic and effectual scrutiny of the Indian Accounts. The present scrutiny is neither effectual nor systematic. A series of Blue-books and White-papers is laid before Parliament, a single evening is set apart for a listless debate when the Session has reached its eleventh hour, and a resolution is submitted to the effect that the revenues of India in the year ending seventeen months ago was so much, and the expenditure so much. Lord G. Hamilton said that the amendments of which notice had been given were purely academic in character. One would like to know his candid opinion of the belated resolution which he himself had to submit. Sir Henry Fowler, whose zeal got the better of his discretion, represented Sir W. Wedderburn as saying that a mass of figures was thrown on the Table of the House without anything to guide the House as to their meaning. Sir W. Wedderburn said nothing of the kind. Neither he nor anybody else denies that the usual papers upon the Accounts and Estimates are presented to Parliament. What the Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee said was that the House of Commons had no guidance in deciding whether the explanations of the Secretary of State were, or were not, satisfactory. The "Explanatory Memorandum," which was distributed this year only two days before the debate came on, is not always so absurdly late. But late or early the "Explanatory "Memorandum" itself stands in need of explanation. Undoubtedly one of the reasons why the House of Commons takes so little interest in the Indian Budget arises from the obscurity and complexity of the subject, coupled with the fact that the information which is laid before the House is, in kind, superficial, and, in form, half-baked. Mr. B. L. Cohen's notions of "ideal perfection" are of interest to only one person in the world. But the language employed by Sir Henry Fowler and Lord George Hamilton was of the nature of objections, not so much to any particular proposal for the scrutiny of the Indian Accounts by the House of Commons, as to the theory that the House of Commons should undertake such a scrutiny at all. The Indian Government, according to Lord G. Hamilton, is doing its work well in controlling expenditure, and the wisest thing which the House of Commons can do is to leave it alone. But, if so, why continue the annual farce, or scandal, of the Budget debate? Why not leave the whole field of financial administration, in form as well as in fact, to the Government of India?

Secretaries of State, or some of them, would no

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

doubt be glad to forego the tedious and futile ceremony, as they regard it, of the Budget discussion. But they have not the power, though they have the disposition, and the point is that, so long as the present duty of the House of Commons with regard to the Indian Accounts exists, the duty ought to be satisfactorily discharged. Sir W. Wedderburn said, and said truly, that the people of India complain that we neither give them a voice in their own affairs, nor attend to their affairs ourselves. Yet we stand to them in a fiduciary relationship, and, as Mr. John Morley said at Leeds last June, if the members of the House of Commons are anything, they are the guardians of the interests of the unrepresented taxpayers of India. Sir H. Fowler implied throughout his speech that Sir W. Wedderburn's proposal was to confer upon the House of Commons control over Indian expenditure identical in kind and in degree with its control over British expenditure. Sir H. Fowler actually permitted himself to speak of it as a proposal that the House of Commons should undertake the control of the whole expenditure and policy of the Government of India, and a proposal to burden the machinery of Parliament with responsibility for all the details of Indian administration. Language of this kind was not merely extravagant, but also completely beside the mark. Sir W. Wedderburn had stated more than once that he proposed to lay no new duty upon the House of Commons, but only to secure the due discharge of an existing duty. The Select Committee which he suggested was to be formed on the model, without slavishly imitating the methods, of the Public Accounts Committee. This Committee, according to Sir H. Fowler himself, has no more control over the expenditure of the United Kingdom than it has over the expenditure of a particular railway company. Why, then, did Sir H. Fowler proceed to magnify to such grotesque proportions the scope of the proposal contained in the Amendment? Scrutiny of accounts is one thing. Control over expenditure is another thing. The purpose of the Select Committee proposed by Sir W. Wedderburn was, as the terms of his Amendment stated, to examine and report on the Indian Accounts for the information of Parliament. He suggested that the chief materials for the Committee might be provided in a special report on the financial condition of India, supplied early in each Session by the Government of India, and based on the debates in the Legislative Council. Sir W. Wedderburn added that if amendments and divisions on the Indian Budget were permitted in the Legislative Council, the Committee would have distinct issues to examine and report upon to the House of Commons. Such were the outlines of a scheme which its author offered to lay in fuller detail before the Secretary of State, and which might well form the basis of an improvement upon the present desultory and ill-informed discussion. Sir Charles Dilke, who pointed out that a similar proposal had received the support of Mr. Fawcett and Lord Randolph Churchill, advocated the appointment of a Committee partly on the ground that it would elicit facts favourable to the Government of India, partly on the ground that it would conciliate public feeling in India. But it was to no purpose. Those who heard, and those who took part in, the debate were outvoted by a party majority summoned by the party Whips. One thing, however, is certain. The proposal will survive this defeat. Lord G. Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler make a great mistake if they imagine that the relations of the House of Commons with the taxpayers of India can be permanently determined by the wishes of the India Office and of bureaucratic officials. The final decision lies with British electors who are realising more and more their duty to India.

WORDSWORTH: HIS PRESENT AND FUTURE INFLUENCE.[1]

IN the parlour of a little inn in one of the remoter islands off the west coast of Scotland, a small gathering of Englismen were trying to forget the comfortless drizzling rain outside that was the cause of their involuntary companionship. Topics started under these discouraging circumstances ran a short course, but not a merry one; and intervals of chilly silence had become not infrequent when some one hit upon the happy expedient of abusing Wordsworth. All of the party would have claimed to be men of culture, interested in literature and in things of the mind; most of them were graduates of some distinction. But all save one were agreed in declaring that they could see little or nothing to admire in Wordsworth, and they were heartily supported by the solitary Scotchman present, who, the more to commend his opinion to the rest, assured them that he sometimes wrote verses himself. The one dissentient felt, like Wordsworth's poet, "weak as is a "breaking wave" in the face of such a combined and self-confident assault, though for himself he was "contented if he might enjoy" the things which the others did *not* understand. He knew, for instance, that nothing had helped him to fix the peculiar and intense charm of the region in which he was then staying as that simple but exquisitely musical couplet of Wordsworth:

> "Breaking the silence of the seas
> Among the farthest Hebrides,"

and that those lines would henceforth be woven for him indissolubly with the memories of that enchanted coast. But how interpret these things to others who felt them not? So in despair he fell back upon the argument from authority, and pointed out that when, as was the case with Wordsworth, the best judges were all agreed in placing him somewhere among the very greatest English poets, their positive judgment must outweigh all negations. "If we "fail to appreciate a classic, we only show our own "limitations—nothing more." It was not a conciliatory argument, and it failed to be convincing to the hearers, who claimed the right to private judgment in literary, not less than in religious and political matters, as an inalienable privilege. Yet the argument was sound, and deserves the consideration of all who wish to acquire a literary taste that is worth having. Intellectual humility is one

[1] "The Works of William Wordsworth." Edited by William Knight. Sixteen Vols. (London: Macmillan).

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of the first conditions of real intellectual advance. If the consensus of experienced critics affirms greatness in a poet, it must be there. Let us not too noisily proclaim our own incapacity. It is better to be patient and to try whether a little study will not sharpen our insight into a genius that has not attracted us at first.

The reasons of Wordsworth's comparative unpopularity with the average man are not difficult to understand. The simplicity of some of his poems tells against him with a large class of shallow people, who, having read those poems in infancy and having, as they think, grown out of them, never return to the poet to read him further. Then, his deliberate avoidance of a special poetic diction alienates that large class of readers for whom the chief difference between poetry and prose consists in the substitution of words like "steed" for words like "horse." It has also had the unquestionable result of revealing the prosaic character of parts of his work; prosaic passages abound in nearly all poets, but in most their prosaic quality is disguised, in Wordsworth it is almost obtruded upon us. An amusing instance of the almost wilful perversity with which he disdains ordinary poetic artifice occurs in the ninth book of "The Prelude":—

> "Pointed upon occasion to the site
> Of Romorentin, home of ancient kings,
> To the imperal edifice of Blois,
> Or to that rural castle, *name now slipped*
> *From my remembrance*, where a lady lodged,
> By the first Francis wooed, and bound to him
> In chains of mutual passion, from the tower,
> As a tradition of the country tells,
> Practised to commune with her royal knight
> By cressets and love-beacons, intercourse
> 'Twixt her high-seated residence and his
> Far off at Chambord on the plain beneath."

The bathos of the italicised words goes far to ruin the passage; but if we would realise the wantonness of the candour that led to their insertion, we have only to reflect how often Milton heightens the dignity of his verse by leaving an allusion in learned obscurity. Again, Wordsworth has been injured by the excessive quantity of his writing. Even so loyal a disciple as Matthew Arnold believed that his master ought to be read in "Selections." And, lastly, he wrote much philosophical poetry; and though philosophical poetry is as legitimate as poetry of the emotions, it appeals to far fewer minds. As Mr. Aubrey de Vere has pointed out, you cannot care for patriotic poetry unless you possess the sentiment of patriotism, nor for love poetry unless you possess the sentiment of love; neither can you care for philosophical poetry unless you have an interest in philosophy.

All these causes have fought against Wordsworth's influence, which is yet surely and steadily growing. The historical importance of his work is, of course, a different thing from its present or future influence; but the fact that the historical importance is now fully recognised and understood by all competent critics of literature is itself a help to the influence. Other poets loved nature before Wordsworth. We have grown out of the mistake of boasting that the love of nature is a discovery of modern times. But no poet before Wordsworth so fully interpreted the message of nature—not on all sides, but at least on her more beneficent sides—to man, or taught him the value of communion with nature: no poet before or since possessed to the like extent Wordsworth's "healing power." Partly in direct teaching that "healing power" is shown, as in the famous "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality," or in the not less magnificent "Ode to Duty," or the "Ode composed upon an evening of extraordinary splendour and beauty"; partly in the pathos ("not declamatory passion," it has been well said, "but passion steadied by its own weight") of his human stories, of "Michael" and "Margaret" and "The Leech-Gatherer"; still more, perhaps, in the haunting melody or illuminating radiance of single lines or couplets sounding or flashing suddenly out of the midst of some undistinguished passage, and thenceforward echoing or shining on in the heart for ever.

The publication of Professor Knight's laborious and exhaustive edition of the poet's writings in prose and verse is a welcome sign that the interest in Wordsworth is fully maintained in England, at a time when the "return to Byron" is being proclaimed by certain literary critics with ingenious advertisement. Still more welcome are the indications that the indifference with which Wordsworth has hitherto been regarded on the Continent is coming to an end. Very noteworthy is the publication in the present year of a lengthy, interesting, and discriminating study of "The Prelude" by M. Emile Legouis (*La Jeunesse de William Wordsworth*: Paris, Masson). Théophile Gautier said that he had only read one line of Wordsworth, and that line—"And spires whose silent finger points to heaven"—was, oddly enough, not Wordsworth's at all, but Coleridge's, and printed in quotation marks in "The Excursion." Edmond Scherer, who also differed from his countrymen in his estimate of Byron, wrote a wise and discerning essay upon Wordsworth some years ago. But M. Legouis's study seems to mark a new stage. It will be curious if English students of poetry learn for the first time from a Frenchman to set its true value upon "The Prelude." Fascinating as a biography, and unique as the history of the growth of a poet's mind under the influence of nature, of books, of companionship, and of stirring external events, the poem is also resplendent with noble lines, some of which (*e.g.*, "France standing on the top of golden hours") are famous enough, whilst others have not yet received their due meed of honour and remembrance. Such are (to quote only from one of the fourteen books, the third) the lines that describe the face of Newton's statue in the chapel of Trinity College, Cambridge:

> "The marble index of a mind for ever
> Voyaging through strange seas of thought, alone;"

or those that condemn the Cambridge of his day—

> "And blind Authority beating with his staff
> The child that might have led him,"

and contrast it with

> "that glorious time
> When Learning, like a stranger, come from far,
> Sounding thro' Christian lands her trumpet, roused
> Peasant and king."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

RÂJA YOGA.[1]

Those who have had the good fortune to hear the Swâmi Vivekânanda lecture speak much of the charm of his personality and the impressiveness of his delivery. The printed page is necessarily less attractive than the spoken word, but these lectures are nevertheless eminently readable; the style is lucid, vivacious, full of conversational idiom, yet rising on occasion to eloquence. The culture and earnestness of the Swâmi, and above all the vow of renunciation which attests the depth of his convictions, claim for his doctrine a respectful and sympathetic hearing.

Râja Yoga, or Royal Yoga, is defined as "the "science of conquering the internal nature, for the "purpose of freeing the Purusa, or in other words "realising the Divinity in every being." A brief analysis of the lectures, given as far as possible in the Swâmi's own words, may be useful. Râja Yoga, we are told, proposes to put before humanity a practical, a scientifically worked out, method of reaching the highest truth (p. 5). The method is concentration upon the mind itself. Anything that is secret and mysterious in Indian systems of Yoga should be rejected. All mystery-mongering weakens the human brain. Through it the science of Yoga has been well-nigh destroyed (p. 12). The first step in Râja Yoga is Yama—non-killing, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence, and non-receiving of any gifts. Next is Niyama — cleanliness, contentment, mortification, study, and self-surrender to God (p. 17). Thirdly comes Asana, posture, learning to have a firm, erect seat. Next comes Prânâyâma, learning to control the vital forces in one's own body. The control of the nerves of another, as in hypnotism or faith-healing, is reprehensible and dangerous. It is not really controlling the brain-centres by the power of one's own will, but is, as it were, stunning the patient's mind for a time by sudden blows which another's will delivers to it (p. 64). Pratyâhâra is learning to control the mind completely: it is a long work, requiring a continuous struggle for years (p. 68). Dhârâna is holding the mind to certain points. Those who want to be Yogis must take up one idea, make that one idea their life, dream of it, think of it, live on it (p. 71). All these steps are intended to bring us scientifically to Dhyâna and Samâdhi. When the mind has been trained to remain fixed on one point, internal or external, there comes to it the power of flowing in an unbroken current towards that point. This state is called Dhyâna. When this power is so much intensified as to be able to reject the external power of perception, and remain meditating only on the internal part, the meaning, that state is Samâdhi, super-consciousness. This meditative state is the highest state of existence (p. 83).

This is not the place to attempt a discussion of the Swâmi's religious and philosophical doctrines, still less to propound an estimate of their value. It will be enough to set down, in no captious spirit, some of the objections that suggest themselves to a Western critic. First, the Swâmi apparently draws a distinction between the evidence for Christianity and the evidence for his own doctrine (p. 3). All religion, he says, is based on experience, but the Christian rests his belief on an experience recorded to have happened to others in times past, whilst Yoga philosophy invites us to try its method and enjoy the experience for ourselves. But the Christian who has any vital belief in his own religion rests it in precisely the same way upon his own experience, which he regards as more decisive for himself than any external evidence. This was the spirit in which Tennyson wrote ("In Memorian," cxxiv.):—

"If e'er when faith had fall'n asleep,
I heard a voice 'believe no more,'
And heard an ever-breaking shore,
That tumbled in the Godless deep;
A warmth within the breast would melt
The freezing reason's colder part,
And like a man in wrath the heart
Stood up and answered 'I have felt'."

Secondly, there is a good deal of unproved assertion, very confidently made as if it were quite self-evident. Here are two examples from page 96. "There was "an old solution that man after death remained the "same, that all his good sides, minus his evil sides, "remained for ever. . . . This theory, on the face "of it, is absurd and puerile, because it cannot be. "There cannot be good without evil, or evil without "good." Again, "Every motion is in a circle. . . . "A straight line, infinitely projected, must end in a "circle. Therefore, this idea that the destiny of "man is progression ever forward and forward, and "never stopping, is absurd." A physical analogy transferred to the spiritual sphere is here treated as a proof. Thirdly, nothing could be more emphatic than the Swâmi's assertion, "There is no mystery "in what I preach," nothing more decisive than his condemnation of all "mystery-mongering." After this the chapter on "powers" in the Yoga Aphorisms inflicts a shock upon the reader. What is the Swâmi's own attitude towards the Aphorisms which he there expounds? Lastly, whilst it would be easy to quote noble and splendid sayings both from the Aphorisms and from the Swâmi's own teaching, the doubt arises whether, in what is distinctively Oriental, any valuable contribution is made to religious thought. Cannot anything that is of solid value be paralleled at once from Western thought, from Plato and Aristotle, to say nothing of Spinoza and other modern philosophers? It is the more necessary to insist on this doubt, because if most minds are unduly conservative and unreasonably repelled by what is new and strange, others are strongly attracted by it, and never so much as when the new brings with it subtle reminiscences of the old.

[1] "Yoga Philosophy." Lectures delivered in New York, Winter of 1895-96, by the "Swâmi Vivekânanda" on Râja Yoga, or Conquering the Internal Nature. Also Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms with Commentaries. (London and Bombay: Longmans.)

The *Daily Chronicle* of August 20th contained an interesting article on "Railways in India." Referring to the guaranteed railways the writer said: "Some twenty years ago the Government might have purchased these railways under the contract at a very different figure from that which they will have to pay when the next option falls due (in a few years' time). A well-known financial expert has calculated the present loss to the Government of India on this account alone at £800,000 annually."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

 Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons on August 13th may be said to have proved that the general public are more keenly interested than members of Parliament are in Indian affairs. The Strangers' Gallery was crowded. But on the floor of the House itself the maximum attendance was 22, falling sometimes to 12. As 144 members (including the tellers) took part in the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment, it is obvious that most of those who voted had not heard the debate. The solitary occupant of the Front Opposition Bench was Sir Henry Fowler. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir Matthew White Ridley and two or three other Ministers were present to support Lord George Hamilton for a short time, but their interest or patience was soon exhausted.

A correspondent who was present in the House during the debate writes: The bare benches were a silent yet eloquent refutation of the oft-reiterated fiction that every member of the House of Commons is a member for India. The picture of India's present and future prosperity, as painted by Lord G. Hamilton, was indeed bright and alluring. But its fanciful and picturesque colouring assumed an almost sombre hue by contrast with the picture presented by his predecessor in office. An interesting incident was the friendly conversation between Lord G. Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler pending the Speaker's return "after the usual interval." It was a fitting prelude to what followed. A visitor, and late arrival at the House, who failed to recognise the speaker of the moment—Sir Henry Fowler—was to be pardoned for imagining, as he did, that he was listening to a speech from a member of the Government. The duty of an Opposition may not invariably be to oppose. But can it be said to be the duty of an ex-Minister to act exclusively as a hostile critic of individual members of his own party while, at the same time, he merely echoes or endorses the statements of his successor?

In the division on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment the voting was 30 "for" and 110 "against." These figures, of course, do not include the "tellers," who were Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. H. J. Wilson for the minority, and Sir W. Walrond and Mr. Anstruther for the majority. The minority included, apart from the tellers, 20 members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, namely:—Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and Messrs. Bayley, Burns, Caldwell, Cameron, Dalziel, Hogan, Horniman, Jones, Lewis, Lough, Maden, Roberts, Shaw, Souttar, Stanhope, Stuart, Ure, Carvell Williams, and Yoxall. Among the other members who voted for Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment were Mr. Timothy M. Healy, Mr. Maurice Healy, and Mr. Michael Davitt. The majority against the amendment included Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. T. E. Ellis, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. J. Chamberlain, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. George Curzon, Sir John Gorst, Sir Andrew Scoble, and—need we add?—Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree.

It may be mentioned that Sir W. Wedderburn, having moved his amendment, was thereby precluded from speaking on any other amendment to the motion to go into Committee.

The notices of Motion, now standing in the Order-book of the House of Commons for next Session, include the following which have reference to India:

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—East India (Native Army)—To call attention to the defective system of officering the native army of India, as regards its British officers; and to move a Resolution.

On going into Committee of Supply:—

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—On Army Estimates, to call attention to the inadequacy, for purposes of Imperial and Colonial defence, of our present military system; and to move a Resolution suggesting means for its expansion.

General Sir Henry Havelock-Allan,—On Army Estimates, to call attention to the administration of the Ordnance Factories, as regards the supply of guns and small arms for the army and navy; and to move a Resolution.

Mr. H. J. Wilson has given notice that he will move for a Return showing for the last ten years the acreage under poppy in India; the amount of advances to the cultivators for crude opium; the quantity of opium produced in the factories, distinguishing between the Behar and Benares agencies; the quantity exported to China and other countries; the quantity of Malwa and other opium purchased by the Indian Government; and the quantity which in any other way came under the cognisance of the Indian Government.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, as will be seen from the report which we print elsewhere, adjourned on August 4th until January next. It is anticipated that the Commission will shortly issue an important volume containing the first section of the evidence—that, namely, which deals with the "financial machinery" of Indian administration—together with a formal report and certain documents on specific financial questions. On Wednesday, July 29th, the Commission heard Dr. Bahadurji's evidence on the Indian Medical Service. Dr. Bahadurji, we may add, created an excellent impression by the knowledge and grasp of his subject which he displayed, and by the manner in which he gave his evidence.

The remarkable evidence given by Lord Wolseley before the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure excited a chorus of condemnation from the English press. The *Spectator*, for example, after making all possible excuses for his "unfortunate and entirely uncalled-for remarks," said: "Considering the sensitiveness of all soldiers on the question of military spirit, and their just indignation at anything approaching a reflection upon their ability to go anywhere and do anything, it was a most deplorable circumstance that the value of the Indian troops should be depreciated by the Commander-in-Chief." The *Manchester Guardian* observed that "it would be charitable to suppose that Lord Wolseley did not mean what he said, and lost his head in his desire to defend the policy of the Government with regard to the Indian troops in Egypt." It is to be noted that Lord G. Hamilton, in his Budget speech, went out of his way to say that in the opinion of the India Council "the native army was fit to go anywhere and to meet any troops in the world."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

What we may assume to be Lord Wolseley's reply to animadversions upon his remarks was circulated by Reuter's Agency, which "has reason to know" that the Commander-in-Chief entertains the highest opinion of the fighting qualities and efficiency of the Indian army. Further, "when Lord Wolseley some years ago published his views on the subject, he then expressed his praise in the highest terms, stating that English and Indian cavalry could with ease ride over hordes of Cossacks. This opinion he still holds. It is his belief that, for the purposes for which it exists, the Indian army is as perfect as it can be." It was further stated that the extracts of the recent evidence published in the press were misleading. Lord Wolseley might well have repented his indiscretion, (or corrected the misleading report) a little more directly.

The Queen has approved the appointment of Mr. Robert Smith Aikman, of the Indian Civil Service, who now holds the appointment of Acting Judge in the High Court of Allahabad, to be a judge of that court.

The following letter from Mrs. Besant, which was printed in the *St. James's Gazette* of August 7th, discloses an aspect of the "condition of India" question which Secretaries and ex-Secretaries of State are apt to overlook in debates on the Indian Budget:—

"Terrible suffering is being endured from starvation at the present time in the Central Provinces of India, and, as it prevails over a limited area, it attracts little attention and less relief. Private efforts are being made to meet the distress without appealing to the heavily burdened Government, and a comparatively small sum would be adequate to carry the people over the worst time. Coming directly from English sympathy, it would spread through the district a friendly and brotherly feeling. As I can get food distributed without any cost of organisation, every shilling given means food for about twenty people; and I ask for a few charitable gifts to save men, women, and children from slowly dying."

Mr. Rudyard Kipling's new volume of ballads is expected to appear in October.

Sir Richard Temple has completed his autobiographical work setting forth the narrative of his long public life in India and at home. It will be published in the autumn.

It is officially announced that an open competitive examination for admission to the Civil Service of India will be held in London, commencing on August 3rd, 1897. The number of persons to be selected at this examination will be announced hereafter. No person will be admitted to compete from whom the secretary, Civil Service Commission, has not received, on or before May 31st, 1897, an application on the prescribed form accompanied by a list of the subjects in which the candidate desires to be examined.

"Ranjitsinhji," wrote a cricket reporter on August 24th, "is finishing up the season in amazing form, and that he will be top of the batting averages scarcely admits of doubt. With at the most, four more matches to play, he is well in front of everyone, beating Captain Wynyard by about eight and a-half in the averages, and being nearly five hundred ahead of Abel in the aggregate of runs. The substantial lead he now holds is due in great measure to his wonderful cricket last week at Brighton. In the two Sussex matches he actually made 430 runs, scoring 40 and 165 against Lancashire and 100 and not out 125 against Yorkshire. In both matches he had the satisfaction of saving his side from defeat. If he had only made average scores Sussex would inevitably have been beaten on both occasions. Ranjitsinhji has won a splendid record for the year, having scored 2,579 runs with an average of only the smallest fraction less than 60."

The Secretary of State for India has appointed Mr. E. Grant Burls to be Director-General of Stores at the India Office. Mr. Burls was formerly Deputy Director-General. Mr. Robert George Crozier is promoted to the office of Deputy Director-General in the place of Mr. Burls.

MR. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The *New Age*, under the editorship of Mr. A. E. Fletcher, formerly editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, is publishing a series of articles upon "Men who ought to be in Parliament." The subject of the sketch which appeared on August 20th was Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. We take the following extracts from an exceedingly interesting article:—

The annual farce of the Indian Budget turns our minds to the great Eastern Dependency, and prompts the regret that Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee has not yet found a seat in the House of Commons. It was a profound misfortune that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji lost his seat at the general election, and the effects of that misfortune will be severely felt until he be replaced in the House. Not but that Mr. Dadabhai is working with all his force for India outside the House! for he "bates no jot of heart or hope, but still bears up and steers right onward," "in Liberty's defence, his noble task," "guided by faith and matchless fortitude," "of which all India rings from side to side."

It may not be too much to say that if the electors of Barrow-in-Furness had returned Mr. Bonnerjee at the last general election, Mr. Dadabhai's place would have been filled. But when we look around for a real successor to the most distinguished and most generally representative and trusted Indian of our time, our eye is stayed upon Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee.

Yet how different are the two men! Mr. Dadabhai small and gentle, with the gentleness of age and experience; Mr. Bonnerjee, a powerful man, six feet in his stockings, impressive with the well-preserved and wisely guided energy of comparative youth at little over fifty. Mr. Dadabhai with the smooth and tactful speech and the quiet endurance of Ulysses; Mr. Bonnerjee with the fighting strength and skill of a civil Achilles. At the same time there are notable points of likeness between these remarkable men. The native blood that circulates in the veins of both of them manifests itself in character-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

istic ways. If Mr. Dadabhai is a representative Parsi, Mr. Bonnerjee exhibits all the better qualities of the trained Hindu; and both of them know how to reconcile the warmest loyalty to England with the warmest patriotism for India. Both have always been frankly outspoken in their criticisms of English rule in India, and neither of them has ever condescended to carping or unfair attack, any more than to hollow flatteries. Such an attitude of mind on the part of the ablest men of India ought to be invaluable to us if we would only take advantage of it; and nowhere ought to be more effective for good than on the floor of the House at Westminster. Like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is known and trusted throughout the length and breadth of the Peninsula, and he knows even better than Mr. Dadabhai the present feeling of his countrymen on all the important points of current discussion. No more valuable member could be placed in the House of Commons by a British constituency at the present time; and no member would do his constituents higher honour or more effective service.

For, again like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is not a mere home-keeping Indian. On the contrary, he is as much at home at Croydon as he is at Calcutta, and his training has been largely influenced by English contact. Once more like Mr. Dadabhai, Mr. Bonnerjee is a self-made man—such a man as Englishmen are especially delighted to honour. He first planted his foot on the ladder by gaining a scholarship, which took him to London to study law. He was called to the Bar at Lincoln's Inn some thirty years ago; and his subsequent rise to the leading position he has long held at the Calcutta Bar shows the stuff he is made of and the diligence of his early preparation. It is a striking tribute to his forensic ability that he can throw down his briefs any day in Calcutta, establish himself at Kidderpore House at Croydon for six months, and return to find his table loaded with fresh briefs the moment he arrives home. To the London barrister such a fact speaks with a cogency that is more readily understood than described. It means mastery undisputed; more than that—frankly acknowledged, and acknowledged indisputably. It implies ability and confidence of the rarest character. It stamps Mr. Bonnerjee as one of the very foremost of modern advocates, and a man pre-eminently qualified to represent and to vindicate the rights of those that place their trust in him. But what we were mainly concerned for was to point to Mr. Bonnerjee's touch with English thought and feeling. Not only did he go through the usual course of preparation for his professional career in London, but, if we are not mistaken, he at the same time had experience of journalism. We believe we are right in claiming him as a quondam confrère. In the less prosperous days of his student life here, he acted as London correspondent, or at any rate contributed largely to the columns of a well-known provincial newspaper. Since these days he has always kept in close touch with English life. As we have indicated, he keeps a permanent residence at Croydon, and he is well-known in London. His candidature at Barrow showed how fully he is abreast of English politics, and next time he tries conclusions at Barrow it is safe to predict that the few hundred votes that put Mr. Cayzer at the top of the poll will then be cast for Mr. Bonnerjee.

Mr. Bonnerjee enjoys the unique distinction of having been chosen as First President of the Indian National Congress, when it assembled at Bombay in December, 1885. He shares with Mr. Dadabhai the further distinction of having been elected for the second time President, at the Allahabad meeting in December, 1892. There could be no higher testimony to the esteem in which Mr. Bonnerjee is held in point of character and ability by the most progressive of his countrymen. That first meeting at Bombay was assuredly, as Mr. Bonnerjee then called it, and as all the world must now acknowledge, a "great and memorable gathering," and Mr. Bonnerjee did a man's part towards its accomplishment.

It is unhappily notorious that our officials are disastrously ignorant of the real feeling of the people; and it is correspondingly clear that no better clue to that feeling is available in the existing circumstances than the voice of the National Congress. It is also as plain as a pike-staff that the natural effects of the education we have laboured to promote in India, directly or indirectly, must have their free course; and it is quite certain to anyone outside officialism that they will eventually justify themselves.

We trust the time is not far distant when some long-sighted and patriotic constituency will do itself the honour, and its country the service, of placing Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee on the Liberal benches of the House of Commons.

THE "BUDGET" DEBATE: OFFICIAL RECORD.

The following official record of the debate on the Indian Budget appeared in the Parliamentary "Votes and Proceedings" for August 13th:

37. East India Revenue Accounts,—Order for Committee thereupon read;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair":—

Amendment proposed, to leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, "with a view to the effectual discharge of its existing duty in respect of the finances of India, this House is of opinion that the East India Accounts should each year be examined and reported on by a Select Committee of the House, thus *mutatis mutandis* assimilating the practice as regards Indian Accounts to that followed, by means of the Public Accounts Committee, in respect of the Accounts of the United Kingdom"—(*Sir William Wedderburn*)—instead thereof:

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question":—The House divided: Ayes 110, Noes 30.

Main Question put, and agreed to. Considered in Committee:

(In the Committee.)

RESOLVED, That it appears, by the Accounts laid

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1895, was Rx. 95,187,429; that the total Expenditure in India and in England charged against the Revenue was Rx. 94,494,319; that there was a Surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of Rx. 693,110; and that the Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works not charged against Revenue was Rx.4,446,231. (Secretary, Lord George Hamilton.)

Resolution to be reported.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

EVIDENCE OF LORD WOLSELEY.

REMARKABLE OBSERVATIONS ON THE INDIAN ARMY.

Lord Wolseley was examined before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure at the India Office on July 29th. Lord Welby presided. The Commissioners present were:—Lord Welby, Mr. Jackson, M.P., Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Naoroji, Sir R. H. Knox, Mr. R. G. P. Mowbray, and Mr. Colin Campbell (secretary).

Lord Wolseley said he did not think that the organisation of the Indian Army was far beyond what experience had shown to be required. We merely sent what the Indian Government asked for. It was a very serious inconvenience to our military organisation, and it put a great difficulty in the way of recruiting. The larger number of recruits we had to enlist for India every year added to the cost and *pro tanto* increased our difficulties. The Indian Government was not in a position to plead that the army exceeded the requirements of India and would not assent to a reduction. His experience of India was that it produced a great number of the ablest officers in the Army, but they knew very little of the organisation of the Imperial Army all over the world, and they were more especially ignorant of the difficulties we had of obtaining recruits and of keeping up the number established by Parliament every year. He was satisfied with the organisation by which recruits were furnished to India, because he could remember the old system. The present system of recruiting was infinitely superior. The troops now sent to India annually were about 12,000. In the old days when a lad came and said that he was 20 he was accepted; but now they had physical equivalents for the ages of recruits of 18, 19, and 20. The age which the India Government insisted upon for recruits was that they should not be less than 20. The majority of soldiers who left for India had had about 18 months' service. He thought the recruits for India would be a great nuisance in case of emergency. The emergencies in regard to England were, first of all, internal riot. In a riot in a town they would never think of sending recruits with troops to go into the streets. In case of invasion they would be a positive detriment, because useful non-commissioned officers would have to be left with them. In case of a threatened invasion the men who had had a year's training would be put into fortifications along with the Volunteers. The young boys intended to be sent to India every year would be in the way, in a great measure, and they could only be utilised in depôts and forts. These young soldiers would not be any addition to the fighting force, and he did not think that any serious rebate should be made on the charge to India on that account.

Mr. BUCHANAN: But after a year's training, would not they be good fighting material?—They would do exactly what our volunteers would do. No doubt, in the case of a long war those young soldiers would be useful; but we should not send them out to were the war was going on. We should still have to send out recruits to India.

Continuing, the witness said that the recruiting for the Indian Army indirectly strengthened the home force, but our army was really a great reserve for the army in India; and we were prepared to send out the whole of our army to India if it were required. At present we had annually between 30,000 and 40,000 recruits, and but for India 16,000 recruits would be ample for our requirements, and we should have a better set of recruits. Against that very improbable event of invasion we had the very great difficulty of supplying India with a large number of troops. We could always raise troops in England, but not in India. The men trained in India were inferior men. No doubt the short service had brought about efficiency in the Army. The men who won the great battles in India were between 21 and 30. Short service was established because we could not obtain troops to enlist on long service. The short service was very popular, and we now had no difficulty in getting the 30,000 or 35,000 recruits which we annually required. The men were more contented because they were naturally better treated and enabled to quit the service if they disliked it at the end of seven years. Short service would have been postponed for many years had it not been for the necessity of sending 10,000 or 12,000 men to the Mutiny in India. Before the Mutiny there were 36,000 European troops in India, and now there were little over double that number. The younger soldiers in India were invalided in a less proportion than the older ones. After the soldier had been eight years in India the sooner he was got rid of, in the interests of India, the better. The number of invalided men who died after eight years' service was very large indeed. After eight years' service they were bound to give a man a pension, seeing that he had spent the best years of his life in the service. He did not think a man should serve in India longer than six or seven years.

What is your idea generally as to what India should pay of the military expenditure?—I think India should pay everything connected with the army. Supposing India did not belong to us, it would be the difference between the establishment that we should have then and what we have now.

Mr. NAOROJI: Is it not for the maintenance of British rule that these armies are there?—Quite so.

Mr. CAINE: Do you think that India ought to pay for Aden, which is used for other purposes than India?—But it is exclusively used for India. It was established before the Suez Canal was there.

Mr. BUCHANAN: If India was withdrawn from the British Empire would you abandon Aden?—We should take time to consider that.

Mr. CAINE: Surely, if we were at war with Russia, under existing conditions, we could use the canal with perfect safety, and that is the contingency with regard to India?—Quite so. I may say that Russia is not likely to go to war with us without having strong naval allies.

Is it a fair adjustment of the expense for Aden that India should pay 277,000 tens of rupees while Great Britain only pays 16,000 tens of rupees?—I think that as India pays very little for the Navy, and as the Navy is the defence for Aden, it is quite fair.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Do you say that India ought to pay every penny of military cost which this country would not have incurred but for India?—Yes.

But is not the keeping up of the forces necessarily an obligation to a certain extent upon the whole Empire?—I do not think so. The whole English Army that we maintain in England is a reserve to be sent to India whenever she requires it, for which reserve India pays nothing.

Should India pay every farthing of military expense?—Yes; and the Navy, too.

Mr. CAINE: Surely the Indian Army is quite as much a reserve force for our own emergencies?—We should not like to put our Indian troops in front of European soldiers. I should not like to fight France or Germany or any other army with Indian troops.

Mr. NAOROJI: Is not the India Army maintained for British purposes?—But you assume that it is no value to India.

But you assume that it is for the benefit of India only?—My views are that India never existed as India at all until we went there. It was a conglomeration of fighting States where Muhammadans were cutting the throats of Hindus, and everything that is worth having by India has been derived from English rule.

Mr. MOWBRAY: Do you think it would be possible materially to reduce the number of troops in England, having regard to foreign possible complications and our general Imperial obligations, putting India altogether out of the question?—We should certainly reduce the Army *pro tanto*—all the forces that we have in India. We have men here always available

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

for India; and we keep men in India that are exclusively used for training the Army that goes to India.

Mr. JACKSON: If this reserve was not available India must keep a larger number of troops for herself?—Yes.

And the effect of this reserve here is a great economy to India?—Yes; and the best proof of that was the Indian Mutiny.

Mr. CAINE: Do you think that Eurasian regiments might take the place of British regiments?—Well, during the Mutiny I saw one Eurasian regiment, and a more useless and wretched body I never saw in my life; they would not fight and they were always grumbling.

Mr. NAOROJI: Our object in this Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country in matters in which both are interested. You say England has done so much for India that India must pay every farthing. Now let me read you a short statement.

The WITNESS: If you are going to read me a long essay on some problem I am afraid I could give no valuable reply.

Mr. NAOROJI: You say that England made India. I say that India has made England the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world.

Dr. BAHADURJI next gave evidence with reference to the medical service in India.

The Commission adjourned.

EVIDENCE OF LORD CROMER.

On Tuesday, August 4th, Lord Cromer gave evidence before the Royal Commission. Lord Welby presided, and there were present Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. Colin Campbell, secretary.

Lord CROMER, in examination by the Chairman, said: I was Financial Minister in India from 1880 to 1882. With regard to Sir Edwin Collen's evidence, that matters have changed so much since 1885 that no one's experience is of value, that may be so. Of course, since 1885 there have been considerable changes of policy in the relation between Russia and England.

Is the control over Indian expenditure as complete as that of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England?—Well, theoretically, a member of Council of India is very much in the same position as the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England; but there can be no doubt that the financial department in India does not obtain the same predominant position in India as in England. No doubt one of the causes of that is that the Chancellor of the Exchequer is responsible to Parliament and has to defend any measure that he proposes. But that is not the sole reason. The peculiar position in this country has been that for a great many years the Treasury was supported by one of the most powerful Ministers of the century—I allude to Mr. Gladstone. The personal element is more important in India than it would be under a Parliamentary system; but under whatever system you cannot get rid of the personal factor, which is the most important consideration. In dealing with India under whatever system you have you must depend upon the idiosyncracies of those who are in the highest positions of the country. The interest of Parliament is not always in the interest of economy; but the mere fact that a man has to defend his measure before 600 or 700 people, one-half of whom are hostile, makes him careful in what he proposes. In India the Indian Council has no such support behind it. I think I see running through the evidence given to this Commission an idea that the Indian Council consists merely of a number of heads of departments each of whom is interested in pushing his own department and nothing else. That certainly is not my conception of the Indian Council; neither did the system work in that way when I was in India. Of course every member of the Council had to be acquainted with the facts of his own department and to put forward the interests of his department, but he is certainly expected to do more than that. I regard him as a member of the Council who is collectively responsible for every act the Council undertakes. For instance, I did not always advocate the financial side of a question, but sometimes took the military view. The cardinal principle was the necessity of balancing the revenue and expenditure; and I always found every member of Council ready to give due weight to that principle. I can quite understand that if two or three members combined towards expenditure and the Viceroy supported them then certainly the financial control would be materially weakened; but I cannot say that has happened. The same thing may be said of any Government in England; if you have to adopt measures which are of advantage to the Ministry I imagine that the views of the Treasury would go to the wall.

If there was a large surplus would not each department naturally want to have a share of it instead of maintaining a considerable balance?—That is undoubtedly the case. I have to deal with exactly the same thing in Egypt. There is no doubt that India is exposed to lean years and fat years, and account must be taken of that. You may make very cautious estimates of expenditure and revenue to leave you a margin; but that does not go very far. I think an average of years was taken in India except in the case of opium, where we went upon current prices. The question of financial control must largely depend upon the general tone of the Council. I see great stress has been laid before this Commission about the power of the Viceroy; and no doubt it is very great, probably greater than that of the Prime Minister here. The Viceroy has to give unity of action to all the departments; in England there has been rather a want of this unity of action. The Viceroy sees a great many more papers, and, therefore, he can exercise more unity of action than is exercised in England. In fact, the Viceroy is very much like the Chancellor of the German Empire in bringing all the departments together; and the Viceroy sees pretty well everything of importance to a greater extent than is the case with the Prime Minister here.

Do you think that greater attention should be paid to the finances of India?—I think it is desirable; but I do not find that any one has made suggestions which are going to insure it. I look with dislike at anything which transfers the power of the financial control of India from England. I think the intention is excellent, that they want to deal justly and generously with India; but I do not think that they could take account of local considerations with real advantage to the public. I do not think that I should weaken the power of the Secretary of State as at present, because he is the natural ally of the Indian Council.

Is not the practical control of the Finance Minister very much reduced if the Viceroy takes a side against him?—It is very much impaired.

The supreme power of the Viceroy is the leading thing in the administration, and therefore unless there were powers given to the Finance Minister there could be no check upon him?—Quite so. But I do not think that any power would be of very much help to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England if all his colleagues were against him; it would be much the same in India. Broadly speaking, it would be unwise to impair the power of the Viceroy.

Do you think the composition of the Council of India could be advantageously changed?—All my experience in India and Egypt has shown me the enormous importance of selecting the right men for the right place, and it is of more importance in Oriental Governments than in England. The Indian Council consists partly of Indian officials and partly of Englishmen nominated from England. They both bring experience to bear, and I should be sorry to see that changed. But it is more easy to get the pick of the Indian civil servants into the Council than it is to get the pick of the English service into the public service of India. In Egypt we have solved the difficulty by appointing young unknown men, and the system has worked well; but that would not do for the superior appointments of India. The only plan for getting first-rate men for the Indian Council, for instance, would be to increase the pay.

If the Viceroy's tendencies are towards economy then the Financial Minister does not need further powers?—Quite so. You cannot compensate for want of frugality at the head. If the Viceroy is bent on economy and thoroughly frugal that will percolate down to the whole of the service. Let me put the analogy of what is happening in Egypt. My position is a very anomalous one; but I have not the least doubt if I had exerted my influence on the side of extravagance the Egyptian finances would not be in the position they are now; and I did not forget the military and sanitary expenditure at the same time. And so with the Viceroy; he sees that the revenue and expenditure balance, and with a bias to economy.

Should the Finance Minister be able to explain to the Secretary of State without passing his arguments through the Viceroy?—I think every member of the Council should be able

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to write a confidential memorandum to the Secretary of State, not necessarily for publication—in fact, it should not be published without their consent. When I write anything to the Foreign Office marked "confidential," I know that it will not be published without my consent, and I think that should be done by every member of the Indian Council, so that the Secretary of State should be well informed. I have never had any difficulty through writing my views to the Home Government, and I think I have disagreed with every Government that I have served. Speaking generally, I am very much against managing Indian details from London, although I think the Indian Council should have very great weight in larger matters. In Egypt we have a small committee of financial advisers; but the conditions of India are very different from Egypt, and the same thing would not apply to India. The moral of the whole thing is to choose your individuals well; it does not depend so much upon the system.

You think the audit system has nothing to do with economy?—No; it insures regularity only. My view as to the home charges is this—that both Parliament and the Ministers wish to deal justly and generously with India. But I think it would be an exceedingly good thing if you could have a Court of Arbitration to deal with these matters. It is not only important that the settlement should be just, but it is of the highest importance that the natives and Europeans and the Government of India themselves should think it is so. I do not think that is the case under the present system, and there is no means of making the people of India think it is just. They think that the English view is urged with greater strength than the Indian view. Whether that is right or wrong, the mere fact that it exists is an evil; and therefore I should be glad to have some Court of Arbitration to settle such matters. Take the question as to the proportion that this country should pay towards keeping up Aden—that would be eminently fitted for a Court of Arbitration, consisting of three or five members.

Supposing Indian troops were employed, the court would decide what interest the two countries had in the expedition?—My view was that the court should be confined to those permanent military charges rather than questions of these expeditions. I should not give the Government of India power to overrule the award of the Court of Arbitration; it should only be reviewed by Parliament, if at all?

You are aware of the arrangement between England and India as to the lending of troops; so long as India is put to no extra expense she does not charge the Imperial Government?—I am afraid I cannot go into this question, because it has been a burning question lately, and perhaps it is not quite over.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: Do you not think that the people of India should have a voice in important financial matters?—That touches the general question of doveloping more or less popular institutions in India. That raises very large issues indeed. If I were asked to say whether anything of the sort should be done, I should say: See first of all how the natives of India have exercised the authority which had already been given them on the municipal boards where they have been sitting a good many years, and if I found that they had exercised those powers wisely and in the interests generally of their fellow-countrymen or the taxpayers, then I should have something to say in favour of very gradual and tentative experimental measures for giving them a voice in the affairs of India. But it is a difficult question; and I should not like to give an opinion without hearing the views of the highest officials of India on the matter. I do not say that I oppose it at all; but such a step should not be taken without consulting the highest Indian authorities.

Asked whether some check should not be put on Indian matters by members of Parliament being able to reduce the salary of the Indian Secretary, Lord Cromer replied that he had not gone into that; but he could mention a few cases where Parliamentary intervention had done harm; for instance, in the cases of the agitation against opium and the Contagious Diseases Acts. No doubt the intentions of Parliament were excellent, but on account of the want of knowledge in dealing with Indian questions its interference would probably do harm.

Mr. NAOROJI said he had been advised by the Chairman to reserve his views in order to give them to the Commission as a witness, and consequently he would not put any questions to Lord Cromer.

The Commission adjourned till January next.

Reviews.

A SOCIAL REFORMER.

India; Forty Years of Progress and Reform. Being a Sketch of the Life and Times of Behramji M. Malabari. By R. P. KARKARIA. (London: Henry Frowde. 1896.)

Mr. Karkaria has already done excellent service to literature by rescuing from the records of the Bombay Asiatic Society "Carlyle's Unpublished Lectures on European Literature and Culture." He now takes another step in advance in hero-worship, and presents to English readers a concise, clear, and effective sketch of the distinctive life and work of Mr. Malabari, as the central force in social progress and reform during the past generation in India. It is not for us to assign the comparative niche of greatness that Mr. Malabari is entitled to; that may well be left to the future critic. But we will not quarrel with Mr. Karkaria for adopting the view of Sir John Scott, who described our hero as "the best man that India in the course of her new development has produced." Mr. Malabari would no doubt join with us in wishing heartily that there were hundreds and thousands of men and women to whom the same general expression of admiring approval might be legitimately applied. Let us admire Mr. Malabari without assessing him and classifying him with historical precision, or attributing to him the whole, or even the largest part, of the credit for recent social advances in India. At the same time let Mr. Karkaria speak:

"Of nothing could England be more justly proud than of having been the means of organizing this small band of (social) reformers in India, imbued not only with the literature and learning, but also with the real Christian charity, of the West. At the head of these stands the subject of our sketch, who has used all his great gifts for the advancement of the cause, the vital importance of which he was really the first to recognize, and which, but for him, it is not too much to say would never have obtained its now universal recognition. How he realized social reform as the one great task of his life, devoting to it everything in his power, and making for it sacrifices which alone stamp him as a rare character in a self-seeking age; how, from a hopeless and discredited cause, ridiculed as utterly impracticable, he gave to it its proper place as the burning question of the day, involving the happiness of millions, and changed almost entirely in its favour the current of the influential opinion which at first ran against it; and how, when he finally succeeded in rousing the authorities to a due sense of their responsibility in the matter, and in obtaining a legislative measure of relief which, though small at present, may develop later into much larger proportions; how he met the obloquy and misrepresentation of those very classes whom he had devoted his life to benefit—all this we may now proceed briefly to narrate."

Mr. Gidumal has already narrated the career of Mr. Malabari, but Mr. Karkaria will no doubt take the wind out of Mr. Gidumal's sails in these latitudes, thanks to the intervention of Mr. Frowde and the Clarendon Press. Mr. Malabari was born in 1853-4, in Baroda. Like many another notable man, he takes after a very notable mother. The glimpses of Bhikhibai afforded by Mr. Karkaria are very interesting. Mr. Malabari has duteously celebrated her in prose and verse:

"What a mother mine was!" he writes in one place; "a picture of self-sacrifice. Some people live to die; others are

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

prepared to die, so that they may live. My mother was one of these. She died at thirty-three, but still she lives in the memory of many who knew her. To me she has been and will be alive always. How can a mother die? There is an aroma of immortality about the word *Mother* and the idea it clothes. . . . I carry my mother about in the spirit. She is always present to me. In every good woman I see my mother; I pity every bad or ill-used woman for my mother's sake."

The death of the "sainted guide" of his chequered youth turned him into "a man at twelve." He had learned little systematically, but he had derived deep, if irregular, inspiration from the peculiar poetry of the Khialis, itinerant bards whose music and frolics he had enjoyed in the streets of Surat. He made a small income from pupils, often older than himself, and attended school in his off-hours; first, for three or four years, in Surat, and later in Bombay.

"He cultivated his natural bent for literature, especially poetry, and ranged in a desultory manner over a wide field of English verse. His mastery over the language was increasing, and it is interesting to find him appreciating rationally and critically, even at that early age, most of the greatest poets of England. 'I have ranged aimlessly,' says he, 'over a very wide field of poetry, English as well as Indian; also Persian and Greek translated. As to English masters, Shakespeare was my daily companion during school days, and a long while after that. Much of my worldly knowledge I owe to this greatest of seers and practical thinkers. Milton filled me with awe. Somehow I used to feel unhappy when the turn came for "Paradise Lost." His torrent of words frightened me as much by their stateliness as by monotony. Nor could I sympathise with some of the personal teachings of this grand old singer. Wordsworth is my philosopher, Tennyson my poet. Amongst my many prizes at school I remember having received a bulky volume named "Selections from British Poets," carried home for me by an elder companion. I used to dip into this unwieldy folio, and got to know a little of Chaucer, Spenser, and other stars, earlier as well as later, through it. At school I had Campbell for another favourite, preferred Dryden to Pope, and Scott to several of his contemporaries. Cowper and Goldsmith I have always valued as dear old schoolmasters; Byron and Burns are boon companions, when in the mood; Shelley and Keats as explorers of dreamland, who fascinate one by their subtle fancies.'"

From Surat Mr. Malabari brought with him to Bombay some Gujarati verse of his own making, and showed it to the Rev. J. Van Someron Taylor, who passed him on with it to the famous Scotch missionary, Dr. John Wilson, who took him to Sir Cawasji Jehangir, who introduced him to Mr. Martin Wood, then ably conducting the *Times of India*. In 1875 the little volume of Gujarati verse—"Niti-Vinod"—was published. "In the range of Gujarati literature," says Mr. Karkaria, "it would be difficult to find a poet who, at twice or thrice Malabari's age, could display his spiritual insight and wisdom." A year later appeared his "Indian Muse in English Garb," a volume, says Mr. Karkaria, "perhaps the first of its kind to arrest attention both in India and in England." In 1878, "Wilson-Virah," a collection of lyrics, deplored the loss of Dr. Wilson. "Without the direct, though brief, contact he had with that noble character," says the biographer, "Malabari would not have been what he has become" His admirable volume on "Gujarat and the Gujarati," rescued from the oblivion of a newspaper file, gives a vivid picture of men and manners from personal observation; and it prompts regret that the author has not produced a similar work on other provinces of India that he has visited in his regular exploratory "campaigns." "The Indian Eye on English Life" is a remarkably acute and candid survey of English ways through Indian spectacles, and is full of instruction both for Indians and for Englishmen. Mr. Malabari's translation of Professor Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures on the "Growth and Origin of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India," grew out of the common aim "to try to bring the East and the West closer, to unite them by the bonds of knowledge and sympathy." His recent treatment of "The Indian Problem" is distinguished by independence and fairness. In his latest verses, "Anubhavika" ("Experiences of Life"), his heart turns to his beloved Gujarat and the scenes of his childhood. Add to this his incessant work for some twenty years on the *Indian Spectator*, and the total forms a remarkable record of successful and useful work for a man of forty-three.

The great practical life-work of Mr. Malabari, his exertions in India and in England for the root and branch reform of infant marriage, is prominently set forth in Mr. Karkaria's pages. The Age of Consent Act, passed by Lord Lansdowne's Government, raising the legal age for the consummation of marriage from ten to twelve, "must be considered a great and beneficent achievement," and in the main it is "the result of Malabari's advocacy of social reform in England as well as India during nearly ten years."

"If true greatness is to be measured, not so much by the greatness of the results achieved as by the magnitude of the difficulties overcome, and of the obstacles removed during the effort, then the leader of Indian Social Reform must be said to be really a great man. His efforts show what could be achieved by single-minded zeal and perseverance. Even after the passing of this Act he has not been idle. He is busy urging the Government to take up the second proposal of the Committee in London, that about abolishing the English-imported law regarding the "restitution of conjugal rights." His work, moreover, is not limited to public exertions like those we have recorded. His private efforts for social reform are indefatigable. He has working committees in almost every part of the country, which help, personally, with money and influence, those who are in need of support.

Mr. Karkaria makes an excellent general impression. We should have been glad, however, if he had been more liberal with details. The dates should have been given with more fulness and exactitude. He is also extremely discursive, although many of his discursions are full of interest and go some way towards a justification of his subordinate title, "Forty years of Progress and Reform," which is far too wide for the occasion. His criticism of missionary work seems judicious, though sometimes severe. His animadversions on University defects betray an essential misunderstanding of the ends and purposes and effects of University education. His political criticisms, usually judicial and carefully balanced, are often suggestive. The following passage is too important for summary or condensation:

"That high hopes and aspirations have been created; that the educated classes are becoming dissatisfied with the present state of things; that there is a strong and a strange ferment working in certain ranks of Indian society, making for unrest and change; that instead of looking upon the English rulers as their real benefactors, they are beginning to view their actions suspiciously, seizing every opportunity of criticising and censuring, and, in some cases, of lowering the prestige of their rulers; that the race-feeling between the rulers and the ruled, instead of diminishing, has increased with the spread of literary education among our young men; that all this is more or less true at present, cannot be denied by an impartial

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

political observer. On the contrary, it must be mournfully admitted by every person who has the good of the Empire at heart, that the signs are getting worse, that needless acerbity is shown on both sides, and that influential mediators are sadly wanting to heal wounds which are not allowed to close. *Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice.* Everywhere and all around proofs of this abound. In schools and colleges and universities, in debating clubs and associations; in literature, spoken and written; in newspapers and pamphlets, plays and novels; in public life, in municipalities and legislative councils; in private life, in after-dinner talk and friendly converse; in short, in all departments of life, this new tendency, this mental unrest and dissatisfaction with the present order, is the one thing conspicuous, almost aggressive. Why this should be so; why the class which owes its very existence to the British rule, and from which additional stability was expected to be given to it, should seem to be uncompromisingly opposed to it, should seem to try to belittle the good done by it; why the official class of Englishmen should be treated, not as friends of the country and the people, whom they serve amid great difficulties and at great sacrifice; why the official class appear to be less in touch with the people than before, and less able to distinguish between opponents and enemies, between critics of their own acts and detractors of the Government, is an enquiry of the most vital importance for one competent enough to enter upon it."

Why does Mr. Karkaria not enter upon it, to the extent of a couple of pages? We have steadily pointed out "the most vital importance" of this question, and dealt with many of the outstanding causes and the obvious remedies. There is balm in Gilead, certainly. But who shall prevail on the political doctors to gather it and apply it? Not even, we venture to predict, Mr. Malabari.

THE KARAKORAM HIMALAYAS.

The Karakorams and Kashmir. An Account of a Journey. By OSCAR ECKENSTEIN. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1896.)

In the spring of 1892 Mr. Oscar Eckenstein set out with Sir William (then Professor) Conway, the Hon. C. J. Bruce and some others for an expedition in the Karakoram Himalayas. The object of the expedition was to make a survey of the country, geographical and geological. The results from a scientific point of view, were hardly satisfactory owing to the defective condition of some of the instruments. They have, however, been published by Sir W. Conway, and Mr. Eckenstein does not concern himself with them. The present volume is really a series of extracts from letters and a diary, put into a connected form, and there has been as little alteration as possible, lest they should lose their character of "an unsophisticated statement of actual impressions as they occurred." The interest of the book consists in the vivid accounts given from the point of view of an ardent mountain climber. On April 2nd the party reached Srinagar, and proceeded northwards. As is natural in an experienced Alpine climber, Mr. Eckenstein continually compares the Himalayas and the Alps. Speaking of the country near Bargil he says: "The scenery here exactly resembles the Swiss, but is on a larger scale. The native huts are built in the same way, of rough pine logs, the only difference being that the roof consists partially of bark instead of entirely of stone." Throughout the book the most striking fact is the immense scale of everything—the moraines for example, which take a day to cross (not an hour as in Switzerland) and the height and number of the peaks. Here is an account of a view in the Indus valley:

"A pleasant green patch surrounded by a wilderness of *débris*, with mountains on both sides almost entirely barren of vegetation, rising 8,000 to 10,000 feet above us. Up the valley one has a fine view of Rakipushi, a fine mountain over 25,000 feet high. To the south is the vast mountain mass called Digamar. The highest point is 26,620 feet high, and as we are here only some 4,000 feet above sea level, one actually looks up over 22,000 feet! I doubt whether there is any other place in the world where one can look up a similar height."

The skill of the guides varies very much in different districts. In some places they are ignorant of the mountain passes and unfit for any difficult climbing. In other places they compare very favourably with the best Swiss guides. At Askole Mr. Eckenstein stayed some time, and encouraged the natives by the offer of small prizes to show him their skill in climbing. From the point of view of boulder-climbing he concludes that "the best man I found would beat the best guide I have ever seen over any kind of rocks. For 'Platten' (smooth slabs) most natives would beat the best Swiss." This is very high testimony to the powers of the native climbers, but it only relates to a particular district. In many cases the writer remarks on the inefficiency of the native guides. The original programme of the expedition had included the ascent of the Baltoro glacier, but Mr. Eckenstein left the party before this was made, retraced his steps to Srinagar and there his diary, so far as it has been made public, ends. Some illustrations would have added greatly to the interest of the book, but the sketches made by the artist of the party have already been published. A good map of the district would have been a still more useful addition, especially as almost all existing maps of the country are far from adequate.

"OM!"

The Vedic Philosophy; or an Exposition of the Sacred and Mysterious Monosyllable "Aum." Being the *Mándukya* Upanishad Text with English Translation and Commentary, and an Introduction. By HAR NÁRÁYANA. (Bombay: Tatva-Vivechaka Press. 1895. Price Re. 1, 8 an.)

From the author's introduction, we learn that he belongs to the Ârya-Samâj. "Much praise," he tells us, "is due to Swâmi Dayânanda Saraswati," the founder of the sect, "whose teachings have, during the present age of Atheism and Materialism, roused once more the sleeping sons of Ârya-Varta to explore their Vedic mines of true knowledge." No wonder, for "it was indeed the Grand Swâmi who stopped the torrent which was hurling down the youths of Modern India to Atheistic views or to religious Samajas who do not acknowledge the revelation of the holy Veda." Still the Grand Swâmi had his limitations. He was not a Brahma Jnâni or an Âtamvit (knower of self). His philosophical thoughts did not even go "so far as those of Mr. Herbert Spencer have done." The Grand Swâmi must, after all, take a back seat. "Greater praise is due to Madame H. P. Blavatsky, who, though of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a foreign nation, did so much for the revival of Ancient Sanskrit Literature and Brahma-Vidyâ." Mr. Har Nârâyana advises his readers "to try and fit themselves for the study of Brahma-Vidya." In return, we venture to advise him to apply his mind to the teachings of the *Westminster Gazette* on the subject of Madame H. P. Blavatsky.

Mr. Har Nârâyana is "a lad of grace." He inscribes his studies to his "respected and virtuous father," and immediately offers salutations to his spiritual preceptor, through whose teaching "my ignorance of Self was removed, and conviction brought to my mind of the real nature of things." We like this marked respect paid to father and *guru* —the fate of the Grand Swâmi notwithstanding. Mr. Har Nârâyana rejects the Darwinian theory with some contempt; "for, if we were to accept this, we would be at a loss to trace the origin of human language and the possession of Divine knowledge, which are peculiar to mankind only, and which are not self-acquired, but can only be learnt from others." But, if our author will only think of it, Akbar's linguistic experiment can hardly be accepted as conclusive; and, on the whole, we would venture to advise him "to try and fit himself for the study" of Darwin, before he make any pronouncements on his Theory. As for Mr. Herbert Spencer:

"Mr. Herbert Spencer agrees with the Vedântists in holding that there is only one Reality underlying all phenomena; and *that all the phenomena being only Appearances of the Real Entity are true only in their relative nature;* but he differs in thinking that the Real Entity is Unknowable in its Ultimate Nonrelative nature."

Mr. Spencer, then, must be set right. We cannot reproduce the author's preliminary description of "the different modes and methods by which knowledge of things both objective and subjective is acquired," and thus the summary conclusion may be somewhat obscured:

"Having understood that there is only one Real Entity underlying all phenomena, one stands in need of a preceptor to know what that Entity is. The preceptor then initiates him into the mysterious science, by announcing the formula that 'Thou art that (Reality)'; and in consequence of this teaching, there arises a particular idea in the mind of the pupil, which he expresses by saying 'I am that (Reality).'' This idea removes the ignorance of the Pramâtâ-Chaitanya,[1] which then knows itself as the reality, the knower of all—the self of all. In knowing this, the Pramâtâ-Chaitanya recognises itself as the knower and not as a known object; the object known being the idea that 'I am that (Reality)'."

Thus, "on acquiring the knowledge of Âtmâ (self), one comes to know that the Reality underlying all phenomena is his own *self* which is Indivisible, Finer than the Fine, Absolute, Infinite, Unchangeable, Self-conscious, and from which all the relative phenomenal world derives its existence." If Mr. Spencer is not hereby redeemed from the misery of ignorance, he now knows where to find a *guru*.

But to come to the sacred and mysterious monosyllable *Aum*. "Aum"—written also "Aung"—is a name, and a symbol, of Brahma. These three letters are shown by Mr. Har Nârâyana to be "the life of all articulate words." For the consonants, having no independent existence of their own, may stand aside; and "the number of all the vowels can be reduced only to A, U, and M or 'ng'." Further, "we have a belief and are conscious that each of the letters, as well as the word formed thereby, has an existence. . . . This state of existence is called in Sanskrit *sat* (Be-ness). . . . This abstract idea of Be-ness has no form or name, and is only realised by men of refined intellect. Hence it is said that the syllable 'Aum' is made up of four parts." So far good.

Now, "exactly like the four component parts of the word Aum, the Universe before us also consists of four parts":—

"The gross outwardly manifested world, perceived through the senses, is represented by the letter A. . . . . The subtle manifestation, hidden from the senses, and conceived by the mind only, is represented by the letter U. . . . The third is the unmanifested world, which constitutes the unknowable part, and which it is impossible to know before its manifestation, is represented by M. . . . . The qualities have no independent existence of their own, and exist only in some substance. Now we see that the qualities undergo change. . . . But the change always takes place in some substratum. It therefore follows that there is some substratum in which a change of the qualities takes place, and that this substratum is the entity [Be-ness], which is the holder as well as the sustainer of the qualities of the three descriptions noted above."

For these positions reference is made to the *Mândukya* Upanishad. A further analysis of the Universe "shows" that there are: (1) things that have existence, but "do not exhibit any external signs of vivid consciousness," as minerals; (2) things that have existence, and a "partially developed state of consciousness," as vegetables; (3) things that have existence, and "a comparatively more developed state of consciousness," as animals; and (4) things that have existence," and also a greatly developed state of consciousness, together with the enjoyment of blissfulness"—*i.e.*, the state "in which a person, endowed with consciousness, cognizes nothing, but only blissfulness, as, for instance, in sound sleep." Now to sum up:—

"The first two classes demonstrate greatly the abstract quality of Be-ness. The third class shows a preponderance of Be-ness as well as Consciousness, or the animating principle; and the fourth class shows at once the existence or Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness, all combined in one.

"Having seen that the things in the Universe consist of the quality of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness only, we jump at once to the conclusion that its first cause, the Brahma, must necessarily consist of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness. It is therefore said that Brahma is an embodiment of Be-ness, Consciousness, and Blissfulness."

It is not necessary to go into details. Mr. Har

[1] "The Atma (Reality), in conjunction with the mind and the senses, is called Pramâtâ-Chaitanya, or the Cognizor."

"IMPERFECT DISINFECTION IS NO DISINFECTION AT ALL."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
IS
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. CALVERT'S No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.
In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb. and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).
Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed. Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ AVOID WORTHLESS IMITATIONS MADE WITH TAR OILS.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Nârâyana has given his reasons for the faith that is in him. He has brushed aside Darwin. He has read a lesson to Mr. Herbert Spencer. He has acquired Brahma Vidyâ. He has achieved the *regnum et diadema tutum*. May we add that he "cognises nothing, but only blissfulness"? A metaphysical Scotsman would say he has "a bee in his bonnet." The little book is symptomatic of much, and that is why we have been careful to set forth the author's mind in the matter. Such a mind—such an adult mind—is beyond the estimate of Western standards, yet it is largely typical. What Western philosopher would felicitate himself in such a balloon of gossamer in the vast inane? We macarize Mr. Har Nârâyana. But—let him stay in Jericho till his beard be grown.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1896.

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Curzon, G. N., "Pamirs, and the source of the Oxus."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Dhingra, B. L., "Medical Aid for Indian Women." Waters, Surg.-Lieut.-Col., "Bombay the Beautiful." Rao, K. Srinivasa, B.A., "Englishmen in India."

MACMILLAN'S MAGAZINE. "An Execution in India."

QUARTERLY REVIEW. "Our Indian Frontier."

TEMPLE BAR. Lawson, J., "A Day in Goa."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. Perry-Marsh, T. A., "Our Young Soldiers in India." "The Indian Executive."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1896.

KARKARIA, R. P. ..... "Pratapgad Fort and the Episode of Shivaji and Afzal Khan." (Poona: The *Arya-Bhusahna* Press; London: T. G. Johnson) ..... — —

HULTZOCH, E., Ph.D. ..... "Archæological Survey of India: South Indian Inscriptions." (Madras: The Superintendent Press, Rs. 4; London: Luzac and Co.) ..... — —

BAHADURJI, K. N., M.D. ..... "The Anomalies and Evils of the Medical Administration of India." (A. Bonner) ..... — —

HOPKINS, EDWARD WASHBURN ..... "The Religions of India." (Edward Arnold) ..... — —

BHATTACHARYA, JOGENDRA NATH, M.A., D.L. ... "Hindu Castes and Sects." ..... — —

DEY, KANNY LALL RAI BAHADUR, C.I.E., F.C.S. "The Indigenous Drugs of India." (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.) ..... — —

SANYAL, RAM GOPAL ..... "The Record of Criminal Cases as between Europeans and Natives, for the last 100 years." (Calcutta: Sanyal and Co.) ..... Rs. 2

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION:—

HOME CIVIL SERVICE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA, etc. Rules and Regulations respecting Examinations for the. Corrected to 31st July, 1896 ..... 1s. 0d.

HOUSE OF LORDS PAPERS:—

[172.] INDIA (EXPENSES OF TROOPS DESPATCHED TO AFRICA IN AID OF EGYPTIAN TROOPS)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council ..... 0s. 0½d.

[173.] INDIA (INDIAN TARIFF ACT AND THE COTTON DUTIES)—Return of Opinions and Reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council, with reference to the Despatch of 2nd April, 1896, to the Government of India ..... 0s. 1½d.

[188.] INDIA (SIAM AND THE UPPER MEKONG)—Return of Letter from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, dated 6th May, 1896, on the subject of the Agreement with France respecting Siam and the Upper Mekong .... 0s. 0½d.

[189.] EAST INDIA (KAFIRISTAN), 1896—Correspondence relating to Afghan Proceedings in Kafiristan ..... 0s. 2d.

HOUSE OF COMMONS PAPERS:—

[257.] EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA)—Return of, from the half year ended on 31st March, 1896 ..... 0s. 0½d.

[262.] EAST INDIA (KAFIRISTAN), 1896—Correspondence relating to Afghan Proceedings in Kafiristan ..... 0s. 2d.

[263.] EAST INDIA (SIAM AND THE UPPER MEKONG)—Letter from the Government of India, to the Secretary of State, dated 6th May, 1896, on the subject of the Agreement with France respecting Siam and the Upper Mekong .... 0s. 0½d.

[327.] EAST INDIA (OFFICES OF PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATES AND JUDGE OF THE PRESIDENCY COURT OF SMALL CAUSES)—Return of Correspondence between the Government of India and Bombay and the Secretary of State for India on the subject of the Exemption of the Offices of Presidency Magistrate and Judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes from the operation of the Rules relating to the Provincial Services ..... — —

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[C.—8,169.] EAST INDIA: ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1896-97.—Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India ..... 0s. 5½d.

OUDH COMMERCIAL BANK, Ld.

FYZABAD, OUDH.

ESTABLISHED 1881.

CAPITAL—Rs. 2,00,000. RESERVE FUND, Rs. 65,000.

FIXED DEPOSITS are received as under:—

At 6 per cent. withdrawable 18 months after notice.
„ 5½ „ „ 12 „ „ „

Banking business of every description transacted.

RAM SARAN DAS, M.A., F.A.U., M.A.S.B., *Manager.*

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 10. (NEW SERIES.) | OCTOBER, 1896. | Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	289
The Indian Budget Farce, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P.	295
Hand-to-Mouth Adjustment, by Sir J. B. Phear	297
Land Revenue in Madras, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	299
Fresh Complications with the Afghans, by J. Dacosta	301
Our London Letter	303
India in Parliament, 1896	305
Anglo-Indian Criminal Cases	307
William Morris	309
Indians and the Civil Service: Important Correspondence	312
Lord Welby's Commission: Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord Wolseley	313
A Budget Debate in Bombay: Speech by Lord Sandhurst	315
Prince Ranjitsinhji	316
"The Systematic Plunder of India"	318
The Criminal Law of India	318
Review: Ancient India	319
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	320
Recent Official Publications	320

Indiana.

India and Armenia.

THE eloquent speech in which Lord Elgin proposed the health of the Queen at the Viceregal Lodge on September 23rd was received, as all such speeches are, with genuine emotions of enthusiasm and loyalty in India. The fact that the Queen's reign is now the longest in British history offers, as Lord Elgin said, enticing opportunities for oratory. Nor have the opportunities been lost by statesmen or public writers. It is a mere coincidence that just at this moment the people of the United Kingdom are manifesting an eager desire to depose the Sultan of Turkey for his atrocious misdeeds, and are indignant at the thought that their hands are, or seem to be, tied. But what is it that ties them? The *St. James's Gazette* wrote the other day, in an article headed "Do we want a War?"—

"Advances on the North-West Frontier of India, expeditions against Coffee, Kalcalli, or Prempeh, battles of Tel-el-Kebir, scuffling conflicts with Zulus in South Africa, and such-like slight efforts by which the strong, the disciplined, and the well-armed force back or beat down savagery, are serious on the spot and to the men to whom they show the face of death; but to a nation in vigorous health they are trifles. By war we mean one of those great struggles in which the equal, or nearly equal, are pitted against one another." . . . .

Now, advances on (or, to be accurate, beyond) the North-West Frontier of India may well seem to be trifles "to a nation in vigorous health" when the cost of them, in men and money, is borne by others. But they may not really be trifles, after all. The jealous suspicions of the Continent, and especially of Russia, are at present frustrating the humane intentions of the British nation. How far, we wonder, are those suspicions due to the "advances on the North-West Frontier of India" which the *St. James's* dismisses so lightly? How far are the suspicions of Russia likely to have been strengthened by such incidents as the violation of the Chitral proclamation, and Mr. Balfour's sweeping pronouncement that where the British soldier sets his foot, there he must remain? That is one reflection that occurs to those who try to regard the present excitement—to our thinking, an entirely praiseworthy excitement—against Abdul Hamid, from a truly Imperial point of view. Another reflection may be stated in words which Cobden wrote nearly forty years ago:—

"What a pretentious and hypocritical people we are in our dealings with the outside world! How we abuse and bully King Bomba because he will not govern his lazzaroni according to our notions of constitutionalism! But when you propose to apply a little of our love of liberty to our own fellow-subjects in India, 'oh! oh!' is the reply you meet with in the House. Yet you would have no difficulty in carrying the cheers of the said House for any proposal to put the slaves in America or Cuba immediately on the same political level as their masters. This nation will meet with a terrible check some day unless it makes a little better progress in the science of self-knowledge."

We are not, of course, suggesting that so long as

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

there are blots upon British rule in India the British public should tolerate with complacency misrule, however foul, elsewhere. Our point is the very different one that we cannot be too hostile to any misrule; and it is to be hoped that the present storm of humanitarian emotion will not subside without producing at least some searchings of heart about India. Some people are so constituted as to perceive more readily something distant which somebody else should put right than something close at hand which they should put right themselves. But it is not exactly an admirable quality. Let us not forget that, as Principal Miller, Moderator of the Free Church of Scotland, said in an excellent address at Buckie the other day:—

"In India we have to do with, perhaps, the acutest race on earth—at all events, the acutest in the way of judging personal character. We have not to do with savages, but with men who, in some ways, stand above any standard of intellectual activity that is to be found in Europe. That race has presented to it, not merely the theory of Christianity but the practice of it. They have before their eyes, not only an ideal Christianity, but actual Christians, or those who ought to be so. They know not only what Christians ought to be, but what they actually are."

Indians and the Civil Service.

WE print on another page an important correspondence which during the past few months has taken place between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and the Civil Service Commissioners. The correspondence, which Mr. Naoroji has performed a public service in initiating, brings out the fact that, except in the case of commissions in the army and cadetships in the navy, as to which we may have something to say later, British subjects in India are equally admissible with British subjects in the United Kingdom to the examinations held by the Civil Service Commission. It is satisfactory to find that in the matter, at any rate, of employment in the Civil Service of the United Kingdom, the legitimate claims of our Indian fellow-subjects are theoretically recognised. We say "theoretically," because the actual mode in which the examinations of the Civil Service Commission are held reduces the theory of equality throughout the Empire almost to a dead letter. In other words, while, for the convenience of Scotch and Irish candidates, examinations are held in Edinburgh and Dublin, Indian candidates are required to travel many thousands of miles, and are impeded by special difficulties, not solely of a pecuniary kind, if they seek to avail themselves of their rights as Imperial citizens. It may, no doubt, be urged that as the examinations in question have to do with employment in the United Kingdom, Edinburgh and Dublin have stronger claims than Calcutta and Bombay to be regarded as examination centres. But if we admit the force of this argument, what is to be said of the obstinacy, and, we must add, the subterfuges by which, in spite of Acts of Parliament, resolutions of the House of Commons, and the most solemn pledges of British honour, British Indian subjects are still compelled to come over to London in order to be examined for employment in India itself? Indians may well ask whether Englishmen can think of this piece of un-English tyranny without humiliation. The truth is, of course, that in this matter highly placed officials, including a Secretary of State, have set at defiance the pledges and the expressed wishes of the British public. It is not by such methods that the loyalty and goodwill of India are likely to be maintained, and it behoves the people of the United Kingdom, through their representatives in Parliament, to wipe out the stigma before it is too late.

Wanted: Simultaneous Examinations.

THESE considerations once more derive weight from the results of the annual Competitive Examination for the Civil Service of India. Sixty-two places were open to competition, but the recent list apparently contains the names of only three Indians—Mr. Atul Chandra Chatterjee, Mr. Ardeshir Kaikhoshru Cama and Mr. Satyendra Chandra Mallik, and one Eurasian, Mr. Paul Eugene Cammiade. The full list of successful candidates, whose selection is, however, conditional on their passing the usual medical examination, is as follows:—

Name	Total marks.
Chatterjee, Atul Chandra	2,851
Campbell, John	2,739
Johnston, James	2,719
Davis, Charles Thomas	2,654
Butler, Frederick George Augustus	2,645
Sanger, William	2,638
O'Donnell, Samuel Perry	2,611
Barstow, George Lewis	2,547
Emanuel, Alfred Edward Lewis	2,539
Malan, Walter de Mérindol	2,501
Woodman, Henry Charles	2,494
Goligher, Hugh Garvan	2,477
Cama, Ardeshir Kaikhoshru	2,435
Holland, Leonard Duncan	2,343
Swann, Nathanael Emilius Egerton	2,331
Maxwell, John	2,284
Moore, Pierce Langriche	2,281
Stutchbury, Harold Owen	2,262
Legh, Edmund Willoughby	2,241
Johnson, Christopher Thomas Heaton	2,236
Crump, Frederic Cuthbert	2,191
Clayton, Harold	2,173
Hardiman, John Thomas Percy	2,164
Cassels, Walter Seytoun	2,138
Henriques, Quentin Quixano	2,137
Batchelor, Ernest	2,117
Baker, William Thomas Webb	2,106
Pennell, Charles Stuart	2,074
Paddison, George Frederick	2,071
French, Lewis	2,063
Cole, Alfred William Richardson	2,05$_2$

Name.	Total Marks.
Cammiade, Paul Eugene	2,012
Lambert, George Bancroft	1,957
Samuel, Louis Eveleigh Bawtree	1,950
Smith, Francis Jagoe	1,939
Thompson, John Perronet	1,918
Ellis, Thomas Peter	1,901
Gwynn, Arthur Perceval	1,891
Tanner, Edmund Stuteley	1,887
Hignell, Sidney Robert	1,872
Strong, Frederick William	1,867
Wilkinson, Walter Hugh John	1,865
Kealy, Edward Herbert	1,856
Parker, Aubrey Hastings	1,833
Ratcliff, Sidney Charles	1,821
Crofton, Charles Stanhope Foster	1,813
Glancy, Reginald Isidore Robert	1,812
Loftus-Tottenham, Alexander Robert	1,804
Hutchinson, Henry Norton	1,780
Mallik, Satyendra Chandra	1,769
Cook, Arthur Willstead	1,767
Salkeld, Henry Lyde	1,744
Smith, Boteler Chernocke	1,737
Moscardi, Alexander Francis George	1,703
Gourlay, William Robert	1,700
Pipon, Philip James Griffiths	1,699
Bosworth Smith, Bertrand Nigel	1,673
Harcourt, Henry	1,667
Nunn, Harold	1,664
Cross, George Harold	1,661
Dewar, Francis	1,659
Adami, Leonard Christian	1,641

India may well be proud of the performance of Mr. Chatterjee, who not only heads the list, but has a substantial surplus to spare. Mr. Cama's name also appears among the successful candidates for the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Home Civil Service and the Eastern Cadetships, the three examinations being now held together. But these brilliant successes really serve to show at once the injustice and the unwisdom of the conditions which are imposed upon Indian candidates for posts in the service of their own country. India produces a Chatterjee, who carries off in the schools laurels that remind us of Prince Ranjitsinhji's achievements in the cricket-field. One Indian heads the list of competition-wallahs while another heads the list of batting averages. But the point is, how many mute, inglorious Chatterjees are debarred from competing by the preliminary fine involved in the present pilgrimage to London? Nor is it merely that this thought rankles in the minds of Indians. The present system also lowers the mental calibre of the public service. It will be seen that the totals of marks in the present list range from 2,851 to 1,641. Does anybody imagine that the tail-end of the list would have shown an equal falling-off if the examination had also been held simultaneously in India? On the contrary, it is precisely the contention that very many more Indians would then obtain places, and thereby raise the average, that candid Englishmen advance in support of the present inequitable system.

A Budget Debate in Bombay.

A BOMBAY correspondent writes:—"The annual meeting of the Bombay Legislative Council at Poona for the discussion of the Budget has come and gone. It has left far more favourable impressions than ever before. In fact, not since the Act of 1892 came into force has there been such a successful meeting. The reason is to be found in the attitude of the head of the Government. It fell to the lot of that sporting politician, Lord Harris, to inaugurate the expansion of the Bombay Legislative Council, and he seemed to do everything in his power to minimise the good effects of the new privileges. Hardly a Budget meeting passed in his time without his quarrelling with some non-official member or other. Last year the responsibility of framing the Budget proposals fell upon the late Governor. The financial member in charge of the Budget, the Hon. Mr. Nugent, taking his cue from his late master, became discourteous towards the non-official members, calling them exhibitors of hobby horses in a Council which he likened to a circus. As Mr. Nugent had the last word in the debate, the non-official members whom he attacked had to exercise forbearance for a twelvemonth. When their turn came this year, they had his authority to regard the Council as a circus and each member as the exhibitor of a hobby horse. Mr. Nugent, who seemed to be thoroughly ashamed of his last year's performance, was eager to obtain the earliest opportunity of clearing himself from the imputation of a bureaucrat:

'I trust,' he said, 'that now I shall not again be inveighed against as insolent and presumptuous, and abused as a bureaucrat, because I liken some hon. members to steam-hammers or their workers. I am not quite sure what is the precise meaning of that common term in Indian invective, a bureaucrat, but being interpreted it signifies a creature who lives on red tape, and, stimulated by that exciting diet, attempts to ride rough-shod over everyone who is not a civilian or an official. I humbly do not think that I am a bureaucrat, and I would most certainly emphatically disclaim the charge of being insolent and impertinent, most especially so to the native gentlemen on this Council, most of whom I have known for years and I am proud to regard as personal friends.' (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Nugent had no occasion this year to suggest that the speeches of some of the non-official members might be taken as read. Each of them spoke out what he had to say, as all had come well prepared. The meeting was to have been held on August 4th, but it was deferred until the 17th in compliance with the wish of a large majority of the non-officials who found the time originally allotted for the study of the Budget figures too short. The additional time was usefully employed in careful study of the Budget. Even Mr. Nugent was constrained to express his

'sense of the care, acumen, and intelligence, if I may presume to say so, with which they (the non-official members) have evidently studied subjects often technical and not very easy of comprehension, and examined the tangled labyrinth of figures termed a Budget. . . . . Weak joints in our armour are detected, useful suggestions are made, and attention is called to possible improvements of our system. Outside criticism of this character is always wholesome. It is well that we should see our estimates, our expenditure, our income, and our administration as influential and highly educated native gentlemen, who do not view them through Secretariat spectacles, behold them, and should receive hints as to objects on which we might, in the opinion of our critics, expend more or expend less than we do, and as to the best way in which we should obtain the rupees requisite to carry on in full working order the machinery of the State.'

Admirable but —Fruitless.

"MR. BIRDWOOD spoke in the same strain. But the best speech came from Lord Sandhurst, the President of the Council. 'I have now had,' said His Excellency, 'something like twenty years' experience of the House of Lords, and I venture to say it would be impossible to find any Legislative Chamber in which the Budget proceedings could have been conducted with more decorum than those of the Council over which I preside, or where more carefully prepared speeches could be heard, speeches better both in style and tone than those we have heard to-day and yesterday. Some of the speeches were long, but of that I do not at all complain. This is the one opportunity in the year when hon. members can put forward their views in this Chamber in regard to the financial and general administration of Govern-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ment. Not only have the speeches been good. They have also been impartial, to the purpose, and free from personalities. I will say this, that instead of the Budget discussion being looked upon by members of Government as a tedious burden, taking up a vast amount of the time of those engaged in administering the affairs of the Presidency, I shall look upon these two days' proceedings with considerable pleasure, though unfortunately we have chosen for this discussion the first fine day we have had in Poona for the last five weeks, and have had to spend the whole of the day in this Chamber. But business must come first and pleasure afterwards.' It is unnecessary to discuss here the manifold topics which were passed in review. The certificates which non-official members have obtained from official members and from the head of the Government are enough to show the intelligence, acumen, and moderation which were the marked features of their criticisms. But the practical question is this: if non-official criticism, though sound, is to have no effect on the Budget, what is the practical outcome of the discussion? For the last three years members have been offering valuable suggestions on a variety of matters connected with the finances of the Presidency and the estimates of income and expenditure. But not one of them has been acted upon. Everything in the Budget is sanctioned and arranged beforehand, and members are invited simply to express their approval and disapproval. That is all. And the whole thing rests there, after the expressions of such approval or disapproval. What is wanted is the power to divide. This is the only means by which the practical suggestions of members of the Council can be turned to account. As matters stand at present, the Budget discussions in the various provincial Councils are a mere farce. The Budget estimates from the provincial Governments are prepared and sent up to the Imperial Government in secret, or without being openly discussed. The Imperial Government arranges them also in secret. The Imperial Budget is discussed as a mere matter of form. There is no power to divide on points arising out of the Budget discussion. The whole thing is unnatural and unsubstantial. The order of procedure should be totally reversed. First, the provincial estimates should be discussed and passed by the provincial Government. They should then be presented to the Imperial Government, who should frame their estimates on the bases of the provincial estimates. These Imperial estimates should come on for discussion in the Imperial Council. Until this is done, there will be no reality in Budget discussions provincial or Imperial, and the privileges granted by the Act of 1892 must remain to a large extent illusory and disappointing."

The Right of Interpellation.

The opportunities for obtaining information from the Government are so limited in India that they cannot be too jealously guarded against further restriction. One of the most effective instruments at present existing is the right of interpellation in the Legislative Councils—a proceeding which corresponds to some slight extent to the Parliamentary practice of putting questions to Ministers. There was recently an attempt in Bengal to limit this right so far as it affected questions on the Budget. But the Lieutenant-Governor afterwards withdrew from an untenable position. A still more important controversy has now arisen in Bombay, where Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, an "additional" member of the Legislative Council, and one of the ablest and most respected men in the Presidency, has appealed to the Viceroy against the refusal of Lord Sandhurst to admit the following question:—

"Whether Government are aware that the system under which appeals from the decisions of Agency Courts in Kathiawar and elsewhere are disposed of by the Bombay Government is causing deep and general dissatisfaction among all parties concerned in them; and whether they would be pleased to consider the extreme advisability of devising, without undue delay, some measures by which the appeals could be judicially heard and determined."

Lord Sandhurst appears to have disallowed this question as involving "matters coming under the political control of Government," and to have referred Mr. Mehta to No. vi of the rules under Section 2 of the Indian Councils' Act, 1892. But Mr. Mehta, who is a distinguished lawyer, argues that the decision is illegal. The point of the rule referred to is, he contends, to exclude, not "political" questions, but questions about matters which are not under the control of the local Government. Subject to this exception, and to certain regulations as to form, any question may be asked. Lord Sandhurst's objection, which he declined to re-consider, appears to lay emphasis upon the distinction between "political control" and "administration." The distinction would seem to be entirely new, as Mr. Mehta is able to cite instances not merely of political questions which have been allowed and answered, but actually of questions dealing with the topic he proposed to raise. Much will depend upon the decision of the Viceroy in Council as to the legality of Lord Sandhurst's ruling, though the *Pioneer* and the *Madras Mail* go too far in assuming that if the ruling be upheld all questions relating to the Native States will be barred. It is obvious, however, that Lord Elgin's decision will have an importance far beyond the scope of the particular question out of which it will have arisen. That Lord Elgin should be invited to permit a question refused by Lord Sandhurst is indeed one of "life's little ironies."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"State Landlordism in Madras."

IT is sometimes useful, however distasteful it may be, for journalists to read their own journals, to the end that they may avoid contradicting themselves. A recent issue of that unconsciously humorous publication, the *Madras Weekly Mail*, contained an editorial article entitled "The Idle Middleman," denouncing Mr. Rogers, who, as our readers are aware, has brought to public notice the deplorable state of the Land Revenue Administration of the Madras Presidency. This was the sort of thing:—

"The petty provincial pride and jealousy which make so many Anglo-Indians ridiculous are nowhere more rampant than in the Bombay Presidency. In any other part of India it would be hardly possible to find an official of standing and repute like Mr. Alexander Rogers rash enough to publicly denounce, and, in plain English, to traduce the administration of another Presidency of which he is profoundly ignorant. Many of our readers have no doubt heard quite enough about Mr. Rogers, but some of our native friends are still trying to persuade themselves that Mr. Rogers is right, and the Madras Government culpably wrong."

And so forth and so on. Yet we find summarised, in an article headed "The Re-settlement of the Godavery District," in the same issue of the *Madras Weekly Mail*, the official opinion of Mr. Clerk, Deputy Commissioner of Settlement, who was directed by the Board of Revenue to make enquiries on the spot regarding the incidence of the present rates of assessment in the Godavery and Kistna Districts, and consider how far and in what manner they needed to be revised. The substance of Mr. Clerk's opinion is given as follows: "The original classification was not uniform, inequalities in classification being discounted as far as possible by the group assigned to the village." This means, in plain English, that the mistakes in classification were not rectified, but deliberately allowed to stand and to be kept out of sight by wrongly transferring villages from one group to another. "The grouping of villages for dry assessment had not been made with reference to markets, canals, etc., but solely with reference to the fertility of their soils." This method of grouping is, of course, entirely wrong. The classification of soils according to their fertility, if rightly carried out, adjusts equitably the burden of assessment to be laid on the several lands as compared *inter se*, and in no way discriminates between the general level of revenue charges to be laid on the several villages equitably according to the greater or less cost to their cultivators of conveying their produce to market. Again, "the capacity of the several sources of irrigation in each village had not been taken into consideration." A more flagrant blot in classification of wet soils could hardly be conceived. Moreover, under the existing system there were only three sorts in each class of soil and the scale of money rates was consequently limited. In regard to the last Mr. Clerk was of opinion that a more elastic table of rates was necessary to lighten the admittedly heavy assessment on the poorer soils. He also pointed out that ever since the original settlement the black clay wet soils had been paying higher assessment than the black loam, notwithstanding the fact that the crop experiments proved that the latter are more productive than the former. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that Mr. Clerk strongly recommended, after discovering this state of affairs, that there should be a re-classification of all soils, wet and dry, within the delta on the lines sanctioned in the Tanjore district. Could there be a stronger confirmation of the contentions that Mr. Rogers has urged in our columns with regard to the system of classification of soils and cash assessment on lands in Madras than this official report submitted by an experienced Settlement Officer under the Board of Revenue, after personal enquiry into the existing state of affairs?

Twelve Months in Gondal.

"HAPPY the people that have no history." The Dewan of the Gondal State, in his interesting "summary of events of the administration" for the year 1895-96, observes that the past twelve months were not marked by stirring or important incidents. "The whole period passed off smoothly, bearing marks of satisfactory progress all round." The conclusion is a welcome one, and it is borne out by the compact record which follows it. The population of the State is estimated at 161,036. The average revenue is Rx. 120,000. There are 76 schools in the State, they number 5,417 pupils, and the figures for last year compared with the figures of the year before show a notable increase alike in the number of scholars and in the average attendance. The heir-apparent is now at Eton, and another son of the Thakor Saheb is reading medicine at Edinburgh. During the year his highness has instituted a new scholarship—in veterinary surgery. "Any system of medical relief must be incomplete without adequate provision being made for treating and healing the diseases of useful domestic animals. These dumb creatures have a claim upon human sympathy." The previous report mentioned the efforts put forth by the Thakor Saheb to extend industrial enterprise. We now learn that the Dhoraji ginning factory, which has been enlarged, is working profitably, and that similar factories have been started by private individuals at Gondal and Bhayawadar. "A cotton-growing district like Gondal is a fair field for the development of ginning factories, and the desire of the Darbar to encourage this new form of industry can find no better proof than in the reduction this year of Mandvi Dan, or octroi duty, from three pies to two pies per rupee's worth of cotton imported for ginning

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

at the factories in the State." The land revenue administration was recently remodelled on a basis of cash assessment which appears to be highly popular. The number of offences committed showed a decrease of sixty as compared with the preceding year. "The fire engines," in this progressive community, "are reported to be in good order, and worked well in putting out the conflagrations. The police are regularly drilled in the use of the engines." One reads with unaffected pleasure this simple record of tranquility and contentment.

Touting for Pasteurism.

The movement in favour of establishing a Pasteur Institute in Northern India has been mainly, if not wholly, promoted by the Medical Service and others of the official classes. It is now, we find, being "pushed," by methods which exhibit something very like compulsion, through the departments. In a letter that is before us, written by an officer's wife in India, it is stated that "Government" has sent round "an appeal," which in due official course has reached H.M. regimental headquarters, urging that subscriptions should be sent to support the scheme for a Pasteur Institute. It is well known that the whole of the native Indian press has strongly opposed that cruel system. But its fanatical supporters take no notice of the arguments advanced from that quarter. There are, however, many officers and other Europeans in the services who are not less strongly opposed to Pasteurism, on scientific as well as humanitarian grounds, than Indians are, and they object to being put under "moral" compulsion to subscribe towards that which they detest. They regard these demi-official appeals as an unwarrantable exercise of departmental influence. Besides, there is now no excuse for forcing on the delusive and pernicious Pasteur remedy for rabies. The true and effective cure for hydrophobia by means of the vapour bath and the Buisson process is available in all the large towns and cantonments of India, the requisite appliances for that purpose having been supplied by the devoted efforts of an English lady, assisted by Indian medical men.

Morley's Life of Cobden.

The fiftieth anniversary of the Repeal of the Corn Laws has afforded an occasion not only for congratulatory banquets and speeches but also for the re-issue, in a new and cheaper form, of Mr. John Morley's Life of Richard Cobden (London: T. Fisher Unwin). Among political biographies this admirable work has from the first taken a leading place, Mr. Morley's transcendent qualities as a political writer greatly enhancing the interest which necessarily attaches to Cobden's career itself. This is not the place, nor is it the time, to attempt an appreciation of the work as a whole. But we may express the hope that in this cheaper form it will come into the hands of very many who have hitherto known it only by name. Mr. Morley elsewhere praises the best work of Burke for "the vigorous grasp of masses of compressed detail, the wide illumination from great principles of human experience, the strong and masculine feeling for the two great political ends of Justice and Freedom, the large and generous interpretation of expediency, the morality, the vision, the noble temper." Nobody, not even Mr. Arthur Balfour (whose well-known article on Cobden and the Manchester School is no mean indication of the differences between the two men), would hesitate to ascribe like qualities and achievements to Mr. Morley himself. As for Cobden's opinions on British rule in India, it is common to say that he was unduly pessimistic and that his gloomy anticipations have been refuted by experience. But how far is this judgment really sound? Cobden's reiterated opinions as to the essential hopelessness of British rule in India may, indeed, betray some signs of exaggeration. But will any candid reader (see especially vol. ii., pp. 205—217, and p. 360) deny that in 1857 and the following years he put his finger on many deep, underlying faults. For example:—

"The religious people who now tell us that we must hold India to convert it, ought, I should think, to be convinced by what has passed that sending red coats as well as black to Christianise a people is not the most likely way to insure the blessing of God on our missionary efforts."

"Hindustan must be ruled by those who live on that side of the globe. Its people will prefer to be ruled badly—*according to our notions*—by its own colour, kith, and kin, than to submit to the humiliation of being better governed by a succession of transient intruders from the antipodes."

"There must be a fierce spirit of resentment, not unmixed with contempt for the ruling class, pervading the native mind. From the moment that I had satisfied myself that a feeling of alienation was constantly *increasing* with both the natives and the English (we had some striking evidence to this effect before our Committee in 1853), I made up my mind that it must end in trouble sooner or later. It is impossible that a people can permanently be used for their own obvious and conscious degradation."

"The English people in Parliament have undertaken to be responsible for governing one hundred and fifty millions of people, despotically, in India. They have adopted the principle of a military despotism, and I have no faith in such an undertaking being anything but a calamity and a curse to the people of England. . . . . Is it not just possible that we may become corrupted at home by the reaction of arbitrary political maxims in the East upon our domestic politics, just as Greece and Rome were demoralised by their contact with Asia?"

Our only quarrel in respect of this re-issue is with the publisher. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that Mr. Morley approved the hideous allegorical binding—bright yellow corn waving in a bright green field—with which Mr. Fisher Unwin challenges the wares of the railway bookstall.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INDIAN BUDGET FARCE.

BY SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

I HAD always supposed that no sane human being regarded the annual debate on the Indian Budget as anything but a discreditable farce. But from their utterances on the 13th of August last it appears that Lord George Hamilton and his faithful henchman Sir Henry Fowler think otherwise. The financial affairs of some 200 millions of our fellow citizens are disposed of at one sitting, before a scanty, jaded, and impatient House, at the close of an expiring Session; and during this one sitting the House is supposed to deal sufficiently with the annual expenditure of nearly 1,000 millions of rupees, a rupee being to the famine-stricken Indian rayat more important than a pound sterling is to the British taxpayer. This seems bad enough. But things are worse even than at first sight appears. For when at a previous period of the Session any question arises in India which dangerously excites public opinion, such as the Chitral breach of faith, the inequitable revision of the cotton duties, or the unjust deposition of an Indian prince, there exists no recognised opportunity for discussing the grievance while still fresh; and if an independent member seeks to make an opportunity on the Queen's speech, or on a motion of adjournment, he is angrily told by both front benches that the time for discussing all such grievances is the Indian Budget night. The action of the Secretary of State may or may not be justified in the particular cases brought forward. But no one outside of Bedlam can suppose that such accumulated grievances can be properly debated in one evening at the end of the Session, in addition to a calm and sufficient discussion of Indian finance. Yet Lord George Hamilton and Sir H. Fowler seem to be quite satisfied with existing arrangements; at least both are vehemently opposed to the moderate and simple scheme suggested by me for improving the debate; and neither of them has any suggestion whatever to make on his own account.

At first sight it may seem strange that the Secretary of State, who is at the head of the Indian Executive, and who is responsible to Parliament for the good name of our Indian administration, should be so careless of our national credit and reputation in this matter. But if we examine Lord George Hamilton's statements, and consider the position of the parties concerned, we shall see that the opposition to the proposed amendment arises from simple causes and influences very potent with the official mind, such as love of unchecked authority, dislike of criticism, and distrust of the wisdom and capacity of all popular assemblies. What was my proposal? and what was its object? The wording of the amendment was as follows:

"With a view to the effectual discharge of its existing duty in respect of the finances of India, this House is of opinion that the East India Accounts should each year be examined and reported on by a Select Committee of the House, thus *mutatis mutandis* assimilating the practice as regards Indian Accounts to that followed, by means of the Public Accounts Committee, in respect of the accounts of the United Kingdom."

It will be seen that this amendment seeks to impose no new duty upon Parliament; its asks for no new powers; it casts no reflection upon the financial administration of India. The proposal has reference solely to the existing and acknowledged duty of Parliament; and points out a way in which that duty may be more effectively performed. Moreover the method suggested is that which we employ in managing our own financial affairs. As regards our own public expenditure we do not give the Executive a free hand; we do not take it for granted that the various spending departments will always practise strict economy; nor do we accept all their self-praise for gospel. Why should we do all these foolish things as regards Indian expenditure? Every item of Imperial expenditure is jealously scrutinised in the interest of the British taxpayer. Jealous scrutiny is more, not less, needed in the case of Indian expenditure; for as regards India we allow the people no voice in their own affairs. The Indian taxpayer has no representatives. We have taken all power into our own hands, thereby constituting ourselves trustees; and I maintain that we are guilty of a shameful neglect of duty if we do not extend to Indian finance the same rigorous care we consider necessary for our own.

Now what is the official reply to this claim that the Imperial Parliament should effectively exercise its control as the supreme and ultimate authority? Lord George Hamilton replies as follows:—

"It is often said in certain quarters that an improved system of control by Parliament over Indian finance could be introduced. I hold the contrary view, believing that the financial control exercised over expenditure in India is more efficacious than any control that could be exercised in this country would be."

What an extraordinary confusion of ideas this answer betrays! If we suppose the shareholders in a gold mine desirous of appointing a Committee to satisfy themselves regarding the financial position of their property, would it be any answer to this demand if the Chairman of the Directors told them that he disapproved of the proposal, because in his opinion the Managing Director maintained over his subordinates in South Africa a more efficacious control than the shareholders could maintain over the Directors at home? The question is not one of departmental discipline, of the authority of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Viceroy in Council over his subordinates; it is a question of constitutional control by Parliament over the whole Indian executive, and especially over the Secretary of State himself who is the responsible head of that whole executive. The objection therefore narrows itself into the natural dislike of a Secretary of State to Parliamentary control over himself being made anything but illusory.

But Lord George Hamilton has a further reason for objecting to my proposal. To quote his own words:—

> "It was no use whatever to appoint a Select Committee to enquire generally into Indian finance. The finances of India constituted a very large question, and he was convinced it would be almost impossible to bring the members of a committee of this kind together in sufficient numbers and sufficiently often to enable them to report with effect on a question of such importance."

This expression of opinion is not flattering to the intelligence, business capacity, or public spirit of the House of Commons. But does not the noble lord perceive that he is proving too much? If the subject is so large and difficult that a Select Committee, including all the Indian experts in the House, appointed at the beginning of the Session, and working until its close, cannot prepare a report that will make the financial position of India intelligible to the House, does it not follow that there must be something defective in the form of the accounts presented to Parliament? If even aided by the labours of a Select Committee, which year by year would become more competent, the House cannot be made to understand the true financial position of India, what an empty mockery the present debate must be, when the House, without any such assistance, is expected to decide whether or not the Secretary of State has given a satisfactory account of his stewardship. I quite agree that the subject is large, difficult, and important. All the more reason therefore is there to utilize all the resources at the disposal of the House; and of all these resources none is more effectual than a well-chosen Select Committee. To say beforehand that the members of such a Committee will neglect their duty by absenting themselves, as suggested by Lord George Hamilton, is to cast an unmerited slur upon the House. A Select Committee has just been appointed to investigate the affairs of the Chartered Company. Does anyone say that they will neglect their duty? No; every one knows that the whole matter will be thoroughly sifted and the truth made known. The financial condition of India, her solvency or insolvency, is a subject which is not more intricate nor less important, than any question which can arise with regard to South Africa. Let then the experiment be tried. An imperfect report, suggesting where a better remedy may be sought, will be better than no report at all. And if the report is imperfect, either owing to want of due diligence on the part of the members, or owing to the defective information supplied by the Indian executive, we shall at any rate know where the blame should rest for the discredit now attaching to the management of Indian financial business in the House of Commons.

For my own part I firmly believe that a Select Committee of the kind proposed would be quite up to the work; and I have solid reasons for this belief, because during the present and the last Parliament the work now in question has been actually done, under great disadvantages, by a certain number of members interested in India. These members have voluntarily associated themselves together under the name of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, having for their object to promote a just and sympathetic treatment of Indian affairs. This Committee now numbers 120 members, including a smaller working Committee of ten, which has from time to time submitted to the Secretary of State, and circulated to every member of the House, carefully prepared Notes upon the financial statements supplied to Parliament by the Indian Executive. These representations dealt with substantial questions of account directly affecting the conclusions to be drawn from the financial statements put forward by the Secretary of State; such, for example, as the true bearing of loss by exchange on the financial position, and the obligations arising from the establishment of the Famine Insurance Fund. It is true that the contentions thus raised by the Indian Parliamentary Committee did not receive from Sir H. Fowler, when Secretary of State for India, the courtesy of a detailed answer in his Indian Budget speech. But that the objections raised were of a kind deserving serious attention will be seen from the Interim Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, which is now being published, and especially from the evidence of Sir Henry Waterfield, the principal financial expert of the India Office.

There is not space within the limits of an article to notice in detail the various issues thus raised, but they were all of a strictly practical kind. Briefly stated the contention regarding loss by exchange was this. The whole position taken up by Sir J. Westland, the Finance Minister at Calcutta, depended for its justification upon his assertion that the embarrassments of the Indian Government arose from the loss by Exchange, and from that alone. This allegation, which was accepted and endorsed by the Secretary of State, was directly traversed by the Indian Parliamentary Committee, who showed, by an exhaustive analysis of the official figures, that the financial difficulties of the Indian Government did not arise solely, or even mainly, from exchange, but that they were caused by the excessive increase in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

unproductive Military and Civil Expenditure. This important contention, which struck at the very root of official optimism, was left unanswered by Sir H. Fowler, then Secretary of State. He could do this with impunity because the Indian Parliamentary Committee is not a body appointed by the House. But if these same facts and arguments had been brought before the House by a Select Committee, he could not have ignored them. He would have been compelled to face real practical issues and to meet the definite contentions of Indian public opinion, instead of riding away on the wings of self-laudation and unproved assertion. In the case of the Famine Insurance Fund the labours of the Indian Parliamentary Committee have met with a more gratifying result. In a paper entitled "The Poor Man's Lamb," the Indian Parliamentary Committee pointed out how, in order to meet recurring famines, the Indian Government, some fifteen years ago, created a Famine Insurance Fund as a "sacred trust," and imposed new and special taxes which were to be used for this purpose, "and for no other purpose whatever." Accordingly the Committee protested strongly against this Fund being misappropriated in order to pay for exchange compensation to the European services, and for military aggression beyond the frontier. In answer Sir H. Fowler not only defended the misappropriation, but denied the existence of the Fund. Now, however, the protest has borne good fruit; and in the present year the greater portion of the money has been restored to its proper purpose, while Lord George Hamilton in his Budget speech not only refers repeatedly to the "Famine Insurance Fund" as an existing entity, but, somewhat regardless of his predecessor's claims to be a financial expert, points out that "those conversant with Indian finance know that it was established by Sir John Strachey in 1881." It appears, therefore, that there is plenty of good and useful work to be done by a Select Committee if once appointed.

The above facts I think prove (1) that the Indian Budget debate as at present conducted is discreditable to the House of Commons; (2) that the appointment of a Select Committee to examine and report on the Indian accounts is a moderate and reasonable proposal in accordance with Parliamentary precedent; (3) that the objections raised to this proposal have no force; and (4) that the voluntary labours of the Indian Parliamentary Committee show that the appointment of a Select Committee would improve the Indian Budget debate by making it turn upon definite practical issues, would assist members of Parliament in obtaining a better understanding of Indian accounts, and would enable the House to lay down and enforce the principles upon which Indian finance should be administered.

HAND-TO-MOUTH ADJUSTMENT.

By Sir J. B. Phear,
Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

We learn from the recent Budget speech of the Secretary of State for India that that troublesome imp "loss by exchange" continues to be as unknowable and erratic as ever, so much so that Lord G. Hamilton felt himself obliged to advise the House of Commons to accept with some discount the favourable character of the figures, which he said he was about to lay before it.

The three financial years with which he had to deal were those of 1894-95, 1895-96, 1896-97.

Of the first of these years the accounts were completed and closed, and although the Indian Government originally budgeted for a deficiency (I wonder what the District Auditor or the Local Government Board would say to a County Council which did such a thing!) the completed accounts show a surplus of Rx. 693,110.

So far, no doubt, so good. But this satisfactory result, such as it is, can hardly be attributed to anything but pure luck, for it appears that as a matter of fact the Government of India had in its Budget under-estimated what may be termed its Home expenditure by Rx. 2,121,468 and over-estimated its Indian expenditure by Rx. 293,382, *i.e.*, as the effect of its double mistake had under-estimated its total expenditure by Rx. 1,828,086.

Fortunately, however, the Government's foresight proved not more accurate on the receipt than on the expenditure side of the accounts, for it under-estimated the receipts by Rx. 2,823,096, and so it came about that after all the accounts closed with the small favourable balance of Rx. 693,110.

The large increase in the actual receipts as compared with the budget estimate was due mainly to an unexpected improvement in opium, amounting to Rx. 1,248,110, and an increase in customs of Rx. 941,000 arising from after-imposed taxation, *i.e.*, taxation imposed to meet the deficit.

At first glance this state of finance does not seem to be a thing to be proud of. But the Secretary of State contrives very ingeniously to find in it ground for exalting the Indian Government to the highest pitch of excellence in financial administration. First, he says the surplus is better than the figures represent it, for the increase in expenditure includes the item of Rx. 555,000 by which the Budget amount of contribution to the Famine Insurance Fund, namely, Rx. 445,000, was afterwards augmented in order to raise the contribution to Rx. 1,000,000, and this is really a saving and not expenditure, so that we are entitled to reckon that we have a virtual surplus of Rx. 1,248,110 instead of only Rx. 693,110. One can only wonder why the Secretary of State, while he

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

was about it, did not remove the whole of the Famine Fund contribution, namely, Rx.1,000,000, and not merely part of it from the expenditure side of the accounts, so as to raise the surplus to the still higher figure of Rx.1,693,110.

Next, dealing further with the expenditure side of the accounts the Secretary of State remarks that the one item alone of loss by exchange, viz., Rx.2,121,468 (which he evidently looks upon as so much coin, that has in some unaccountable way leaked out of the till, unconnected with the expenditure proper of the country), actually exceeds the item Rx.1,828,000, which appears by the accounts to be the excess of expenditure beyond the estimate; and, therefore, he triumphantly exclaims there was obviously no real increase of the expenditure at all.

So much, indeed, was it to the contrary that, adding together this item of loss, Rx.2,121,468, and the item Rx.555,000 (augmentation of contribution to Famine Fund), and on the ground that neither of them is true expenditure, subtracting their sum, Rx.2,676,468, from the total net expenditure given by the accounts, namely, Rx.59,959,786, we get as the *real* expenditure Rx.57,283,318, which is less by Rx.848,382 than Rx.58,131,700, the originally estimated expenditure. Consequently by this method we discover that the Government of India has accomplished the remarkable feat of keeping within their original estimate by Rx.848,000. And the Secretary of State adds:

"I do not remember any occasion here (*i.e.*, at Westminster) when the Treasury have been able to save £800,000 in their original estimates;"

herein betraying once more his inveterate inability to distinguish between Rs.10 in India and £1 sterling in England, for on his own data Rx.848,382 could not stand for more than about £460,000 in support of his argument.

It is surely difficult to believe that the House of Commons willingly accepted manipulation of figures in this fashion as serious contribution to a discussion of the state of Indian finances.

Proceeding to the next year 1895-96, of which, although it expired some months ago, the accounts are as yet only approximately ascertained, the Secretary of State characterised it as a very remarkable financial year. The Indian Government budgeted originally for a surplus of Rx.46,200; but as things have turned out it appears to have underestimated the net receipts by Rx.1,405,300 and the net expenditure by Rx.500,100, figures that have the effect of adding Rx.905,200 to the surplus, making it Rx.951,400 instead of Rx.46,200.

The increase in the receipts beyond the original estimate is attributed to an improvement of Rx.874,000 in opium, and an advance under the other heads of the revenue generally to the amount of Rx.531,300 in the whole, making in the aggregate a total of Rx.1,405,300.

So far things appear to be commonplace enough. It is when we come to the other side of the account that the remarkable features, with which the Secretary of State desires us to be impressed, are to be detected. We gather from his speech that after the Budget estimate was arrived at the expedition to Chitral brought a charge of 160 lakhs of rupees on the revenue of India, the contribution to the famine fund was increased by 53 lakhs of rupees, the revision of the cotton duties entailed a "loss" of about 26 lakhs of rupees, and 40 lakhs of rupees were repaid to the provincial Governments, constituting in the whole an addition of some 280 lakhs of rupees to the expenditure which was budgeted for. And inasmuch as the increase on the Budget expenditure given by the accounts is only put at Rx.500,100, there must have been effected in some direction, a reduction of the contemplated expenditure to the extent of no less than Rx.2,300,000: Some of this, we are told, was due to considerable saving on the ordinary expenditure of the army, and some to savings in other branches of expenditure, but by far the greater portion, namely Rx.1,665,000 was the result of a diminution of the "loss by exchange." This means that the rupee expenditure in respect of the English charges had been originally estimated on the basis of an average exchange rate of 13·09d. the rupee, or 18·335rs. per £ sterling, whereas the Government had in fact been able to meet them by an average expenditure of 17·54rs. per £ (=13·68d. the rupee); and consequently the rupee expenditure on this account had been reduced by the above named amount, *i.e.*, Rx.1,665,000 below the estimate.

The Secretary of State's short comment on these two years is:

"Thus we see in one year a loss in exchange very largely diminished by a saving in expenditure, and in the next year we see a gain in exchange greatly enhanced by further savings, so as to cover very large unexpected disbursements."

And afterwards, having admitted that the market price of silver is the dominant factor in the exchange value of the rupee, he goes on to say,

"What I wish to impress on the House is that owing to the speculative and gambling character of the exchange value (!) the Indian Finance Minister finds its almost impossible for him to foretell how it will operate in any particular financial year, and the expenditure can only be met by a margin of revenue or by financial or taxable reserves capable of immediate realization. In these circumstances we have to ask ourselves what taxable resources we have that are not now in operation."

And the answer which he himself at once gives to this question is that we have none.

So far, then, from the figures of the Secretary of State tending to convey the favourable impression,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

against which he warned the House of Commons, the only reasonable inference that we can draw from his exposition of the accounts is, that the Budget of the Indian Government is a practically useless proceeding, that the annual adjustment of its finances is little better than a hand-to-mouth affair, and that what with the uncertainty as to the opium return on the one hand and the capricious variations of exchange on the other, coupled with the absence of taxable resource in reserve, the task of the Indian Finance Minister is essentially chance work, and ought not to be made the subject of close examination.

As a matter of fact no reasonable opportunity for debate was afforded the House of Commons. And both the Secretary of State and Sir H. Fowler used language which seemed to imply that the curiosity of honourable members interested in the affairs of India ought to be satisfied with the completeness of the Indian Financial Statement in their hands and the full report attached thereto of the discussion of the Statement which took place in the Governor-General's Council. But it seems to have escaped those honourable gentlemen that in the Governor-General's Council there could be no effective debate on any matter of policy, and that no attempt was made there to enquire either into the details of the costly Home expenditure, or into the methods by which sterling obligations are discharged. These are by far the most serious ingredients in Indian finance, and it is in the House of Commons alone that they can be fully and adequately dealt with.

Sir William Wedderburn, speaking in support of his amendment, very justly complained on behalf of India that her rulers "neither gave her a voice in her own affairs nor would attend to them themselves." And to outsiders it certainly does not appear to be an altogether unreasonable remedy, as Sir H. Fowler thought it, for such scandal that the Indian Financial Statement elucidated by the reported discussion of it in the Governor-General's Council should pass under the scrutiny of a Committee of the House of Commons before the Secretary of State's resolutions were moved. What would be the more appropriate mode of effecting such scrutiny is, perhaps, a question upon which parliamentary experts may have a good deal to say. But some practical solution must be found without delay if confidence is to be won for the financial administration of India!

Sir H. Fowler seems to think everything is explained when he says:—

"The great increase in net Indian expenditure was attributable in the main to the enormous loss sustained in exchange."

And the Secretary of State evidently viewed this so-called "loss" as so much abstraction of coin from the treasury, or as blackmail levied by some mysterious and unscrupulous agency. It is probable that Sir H. Fowler's words meant no more than this: The great increase in net expenditure beyond the amount estimated for it in the Budget was attributable in the main to the unexpected rise in the rupee cost of articles supplied from home. When thus read a crop of questions suggest themselves.

Were all these things needed?

What was the cause of the unexpected rise of cost?

Could any of the things have been obtained cheaper in India?

etc., etc.

And Sir H. Fowler is satisfied, if his language stops all this enquiry.

It needs hardly to be repeated here that the rate of money exchange obtaining at any time is merely a feature of the state of trade between the two countries—the precious metals having their place among the articles of commerce. And when it is remembered that the amount of the rupee expenditure of the Indian Government on the Home account is approximately one-fourth of the value of the total Indian exports—in other words, that the Indian Government in effect finance one quarter of the export trade of India, it is conceivable that it might, if it took pains to understand the business, manage, if not to obtain some control over its own remittances, at least to avoid being too often the victim of that "unexpected" which is doubtless just as dominant in Indian finance as elsewhere, and not more so.

LAND REVENUE IN MADRAS.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

For some time back the question of the administration of the land revenue in Madras has been forcing itself unpleasantly upon attention. In recent numbers of "India" Mr. Rogers discussed the principles of the subject at some length; in the June issue some striking statistics were tabulated, and comment was made upon official shirking of the publication of the facts; and last month's article on "The Alibag Revision Settlement" showed that the fundamental mischief is in active operation elsewhere than in the Madras Presidency. We, therefore, welcome a most opportune and able treatment of the matter in the current (August) number of our rising contemporary the *Madras Review*.

In the Alibag article Sir George Wingate's words of wisdom were quoted as follows:

"No unnecessary reduction can injure the country, and the Government revenue can only suffer from it to the extent of such reduction. An error upon one side involves the inevitable ruin of the country; an error upon the other some inconsiderable sacrifice of the finances of the State; and with such unequal stakes depending, can we hesitate as to which should be given the preponderance? The line of true policy under

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

such circumstances is not in an attempt to fix assessment at what the land will exactly bear, but in fixing it as far within this limit as the exigencies of the State will permit."

The writer in the *Madras Review* makes a similar statement of principle in terms that substantially paraphrase the expressions of Sir George Wingate. So obvious is the right course in the circumstances. And this obviousness is the just measure of the official wrongheadedness and perversity.

What is the present situation? We will outline the answer given by the Madras Reviewer. There are three broad groups mainly connected with the land: "The first is the group of agriculturists who formed the military and dominant classes, now amounting to 2,320,288, or 6·51 per cent. of the entire population; next the old, cultivating or farmer class, now amounting to 7,016,140, or 19·61 per cent.; and the field labourers, amounting to 7,036,838, 19·75 per cent., according to the Census of 1891." These classes competed keenly for the residue of the produce left by Government—half the net produce left after the estimated expenses of cultivation. So the dominant class "had to reduce their standard of living, or increase if possible the rent from the farmer, who in his turn had either to reduce the wages of his agricultural labourers or dispense with their services, and himself labour in the fields." The distress was intensified by the influx of "a large proportion of hill and forest tribes, trading, shepherd, toddy-drawing, and other classes"—"not less than many millions of people"—into agriculture, mainly in consequence of the rigour of the forest and akbari laws and to the competition of English manufacturers.

"The struggle for land is thus intensified year after year. Old industries are gone or decaying, and new industries are not springing up. The decay of our industries lets loose on agriculture another large flood of comparatively alien population. The scramble for land becomes intense. The old agricultural and cultivating landholder finds himself unable to pay the assessment which the eager bid of a large class of people convinces the not over-sympathetic revenue official that the land could well bear. He has accordingly to reduce himself to the level of a coolie proprietor of land under Government, satisfying himself with an income from land equal to a minimum living wage, and be content with the standard of comfort of the class of labourers. Where he cannot so reduce himself to a level of life his ancestors and himself have not been accustomed to, he is sold up for arrears of revenue or he relinquishes his land to Government, and the land is taken up, whatever the assessment might be, by one who has accustomed himself to a much lower standard of life, and who hopes therefore to pay the Government assessment. If he again is mistaken in his calculations and fails to pay the Government revenue, he also relinquishes the land, or is sold up in his turn, and a more sanguine coolie speculator steps in, with the same result. If the cultivator is able to pay the revenue by improving the land, by investing his own money on it, or otherwise, that is itself accepted as an indication of the lightness of the assessment, with the result that the assessment is soon increased. No law stands between the rayat and the revenue official. No Civil Court may enquire into the question of any increase of taxation. He has therefore to lower again his standard of life, or to relinquish or submit to the sale of the land. The revenue official flourishes in the face of the world the fact that the lands are seldom unoccupied, that every land relinquished is soon taken up, forgetful of the circumstance that where land is the only means of livelihood for by far the great majority of the population, every bit of land, if possible, will find an occupant.

If this goes on for some time, what, asks the reviewer, are we likely to find? His very reasonable answer is this: "A great mass of *half-starved*, wretched, small peasant proprietors, heavily in debt, their numbers gradually increasing; a natural general degradation in the character of the people; and an entire divorce between land on the one hand and capital and intelligence on the other." The last-mentioned anticipation has, in fact, already been officially admitted as realised. "It is so rare," said Lord Wenlock in a recent address, "that it is almost unknown, to see any man of culture and education devoting his time, his leisure, or his wealth to personal pursuit of this particular industry"—an industry that he had just described as "by far the most important industry in the present condition of the country." How shall such administrative results be adequately characterised?

There is another way of looking at the subject. The cultivable land lying waste is of the enormous extent of over six millions of acres; the table on page 180 (INDIA, June) gives the figures 6,992,817, and the Madras Revenue Board admits 6,392,689. Now this means more than one-fifth and little less than one-fourth of the whole cultivable area. Here is a disastrous aspect of affairs, surely. Mr. Rogers says, and the Reviewer agrees with him, that the responsibility for the non-cultivation of a great part of this waste land lies upon the revenue system. The Bombay settlements, on the other hand, have been very effective in bringing waste under cultivation. What does the Madras Revenue Board say? Of course, the case looks bad, but the revenue system cannot be to blame; and a rate of assessment in Madras similar to the generally lighter Bombay rate might have had a similar effect, only it "could only have been purchased by a large sacrifice of revenue." "If this had proceeded from an opponent, and not from the members of the Board," says the reviewer, "we should have deemed it incredible."

Let us now look at the lands actually under cultivation. Two-thirds—66·22 per cent.—of the pattas pay less than 10 rupees a year; 89·27 per cent. pay less than 30 rupees. The 66 per cent. number over 2,000,000. But while 1,459,753 of the pattas are registered in single names, 564,330 are joint pattas issued in the names of 1,735,486 registered rayats. Now suppose each registered rayat represents a family of four persons—husband, wife,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and two children. The 3,195,239 registered rayats thus represent a population of 12,780,956. Now the official history of "Progress of the Madras Presidency during the last Forty Years," on which we recently commented, calculates that, if nine rupees a month will keep a rayat's family according to the existing standard, eight acres of ordinary land paying a tax of 14 rupees, or a proportionately larger area of inferior land paying a like tax, may be taken as the area that a family must cultivate in order to subsist. On this official assumption, then, here are 12,780,956 people—more than one-third of the total population (including the towns and the Zemindaris)—leading "a life of semi-starvation." The number of rayats that pay from 10 to 14 rupees is not accessible from the statistics, but clearly it would make a very considerable addition to the 12,780,956. "There is thus no doubt that the great majority of what the Government are pleased to call peasant proprietors holding land under them are paupers leading a life of misery and starvation."

At this stage we may present the reviewer's summary of the points taken by Mr. Rogers:

"Mr. Rogers remarked upon the large number of coercive processes as indicating the oppressive nature of the land revenue and the rigour of its collection. It appeared that during the three years 1887-88 to 1889-90 notices of attachment of property had to be issued to 917,955 defaulters, and during those years more than 87,000 acres of land, in addition to moveable property which realised Rs. 2,76,611, have been sold to realise the arrears which amounted to Rs. 3,50,413. The number of defaulters was 64,435. In the eleven years 1879-80 to 1889-90 there were sold for arrears of land revenue 1,963,364 acres of land held by 840,713 defaulters, in addition to personal property of the value of Rs. 29,65,018. Of the land sold, nearly 60 per cent could not find purchasers, and had to be bought in by Government."

Mr. Rogers's letters were placed before the Government of Madras early in 1893. The reply of the Government was communicated to the Secretary of State in February, 1896! The public, however, as yet can only judge of the tenor of the reply from the Government remarks on the proceedings of the Board of Revenue in concocting it. The reviewer deals in drastic fashion with subordinate elements of the case, and then he lays his axe at the root of the matter:

"Now, coming to the main issue, how are the sales for arrears of revenue to be accounted for, except on the assumption that the assessment is too heavy for the rayat to pay? How is the purchase of a good portion of these lands by Government for want of bidders to be accounted for, except on the ground that not even a speculative coolie rayat could be found to undertake the cultivation on the terms demanded by Government?"

The Board postulates that the money value of one half of the net produce "is by no means an impossible rent," and, for the rest, the upshot is that "all these sales, and the ruin of the rayat, is caused solely by the inefficiency and neglect of duty on the part of the officials of Government." On this the reviewer comments as follows:

"The exigencies of a weak case have driven the Board very far indeed! To avoid the natural and inevitable conclusion that the assessments are too heavy, they 'postulate' the matter in issue, and invent a series of facts to justify the same. They have to call the rayats an unthrifty race, and all Government officials, from the Collector downwards, inefficient for their prime duty! Having gone on the track, the Board had to go further. It had to account for the re-purchase of the lands for want of bidders, and the solution is equally simple. The rayats had all combined against Government. The Brahmin, Muhammadan, Christian, and all other classes have formed a clique to let Government take away valuable lands so that they may rob it! It is, furthermore, incredible that men will allow their landed property worth Rs. 7,15,612 to be sold for Rs. 1,55,752 if it were possible for them to pay the revenue. We need not attempt to expose this fallacy further. The Board could not have satisfied itself of the truth of these wholesale charges, which we have no hesitation in condemning as unfair both to the people and the officials who have no opportunity of refuting them."

What, then, is the remedy prescribed by the Board of Revenue?

"Enforced rigour in collection. Of course, if pressure is brought to bear on the rayat, he will probably pay, but it will be the sowcar's money. His present indebtedness is acknowledged, and agricultural banks, etc., are proposed for his relief. But where will be their use till we remove the main cause of his indebtedness?"

Those of us who are accustomed to speak in glowing terms of English administration in India may be recommended to make a special study of this question. The facts are lamentable, and indisputable. Why, in the name of common sense, should it be possible for an able and esteemed American missionary to say, openly and without contradiction: "Whenever I move about among the rayats, at harvest time, I often have the impression as if all are united to ruin the poor landholder"? This, too, when the Governor is publicly declaring that agriculture "is by far the most important industry in the present condition of the country, and on its prosperity depends the prosperity of others."

FRESH COMPLICATIONS WITH THE AFGHANS.

BY J. DACOSTA.

An article printed in the *Times* of September 8th, under the heading "The Last Gap in the Indo-Afghan Frontier," informed us that news had just been received in India of a considerable force of Afghan militia having occupied the Mittai valley in Bajaur, and that our reading of the Durand agreement justified us in saying that Mittai falls to India. The article stated further:—

"The Khans of Dir and Nawagai (against whom the ruler

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of Afghanistan would have to act) are well-proved allies of the Indian Government and . . . . rendered excellent service during the Chitral campaign and since. The latter is directly menaced by the Afghan descent into the Mittai valley. . . . . Obviously it would not be to our advantage to let him think that the Amír of Afghanistan is a more powerful neighbour than the Government of India."

We have therefore intimated to the Amír that we regard this encroachment on Bajaur as an infraction of the Durand agreement, and have proposed the appointment of another joint delimitation Commission. An immediate settlement of the difference is called for.

The questions involved in this controversy may be elucidated by a retrospective survey of our previous relations with Abdur Ráhman.

In November, 1878, during the reign of Amír Shere Ali, three British armies simultaneously invaded Afghanistan on the plea that its occupation by British troops was necessary for the defence of our Indian territories against a Russian invasion. Shere Ali having died the following year, Abdur Ráhman, who had retired into Turkestan, claimed the Amírship as grandson of Dost Mahomed, the former ruler. Kabul and Kandahar were then held by our invading armies, and we invited the chiefs of the Afghan tribes to confer with us regarding the future government of their country. But they declined our invitation and began to prepare for a *jehád* or religious war for the expulsion or extermination of the *Káfar*, *i.e.*, the British. We then proposed to Abdur Ráhman to recognise him as Amír, offering him the friendship and support of the British Government, on condition of his relinquishing his claim to the Herat and Kandahar territories. He accepted the proffered friendship, but distinctly intimated that he claimed the entire kingdom which his grandsire had ruled. "I have been chosen," he said, "by the people of Afghanistan to protect the country in the name of Islam against all infidel encroachments." (Sir Lepel Griffin's article, *Fortnightly Review*, December, 1893).

Meanwhile the British force which held Kandahar was attacked and partially destroyed at Maiwand by Ayub Khan, a cousin of Abdur Ráhman and a rival claimant of the throne of Afghanistan. The prospect of our saving the remainder of that force, which was closely besieged in Kandahar, by sending to its relief a portion of the army we had at Lahore, seemed remote in view of the distance between the two cities and of the numerous hostile tribes who occupied the intermediate country. We explained our difficulties to Abdur Ráhman, and he consented, on certain conditions, to use his influence to restrain the tribes in question from attacking the relief force we might send from Kabul. Under those conditions we paid a million of rupees, we pledged ourselves to refund the treasure seized by us during our occupation of Kabul, we renounced the fine which we had imposed on its inhabitants for conniving at the murder of the British Envoy, we surrendered the guns which were not wanted by our relief force, and we undertook to evacuate Afghan territory with all practicable diligence. The fulfilment of these conditions, the relief of our Kandahar garrison, and the return of our forces to India, brought our Afghan campaign to a close, and our subsequent policy towards the Afghans was, for a time, tempered by Lord Roberts's opinion, as expressed in his despatch of May 29th, 1880, in which he said:

"Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

Suddenly in the summer of 1885 our aggressive policy was revived with a change in our tactics, obviously suggested by the utter failure which had attended our previous Afghan wars. On those occasions we entered Afghanistan at the head of a victorious army, but could neither maintain ourselves there nor retire with honour. The new scheme aimed, therefore, at the subjugation of the border-tribes and the construction of military roads through their territories, in order to secure our communications with India when we penetrated into the heart of the country. For these purposes our Indian army was at once materially increased, and some twenty expeditions were employed, from 1885 to 1895, in attempts to subjugate the Afghan tribes dwelling on the other side of the N.-W. frontier of British India. Those military operations, however, failed to accomplish their main object. In 1890 Sir Robert Sandeman succeeded, by negotiations and money-grants, in obtaining the consent of some tribal chiefs in the Zhob Valley to our establishing a post at Apozai. But the tribesmen repudiated the bargain and constantly harassed our garrison. We strongly remonstrated with the Amír in respect of these annoyances, which we represented in the light of raids committed on British soil; whereupon the Amír enquired as to the actual position of our frontier, seeing that in all our maps the boundary of British India was marked by a red line running along the course of the Indus, that is, at a considerable distance from the scene of the alleged raids. Our reply to the Amír's question is not known to the public. The incident led to acrimony and loud threats on our part, and ultimately resulted in the Durand agreement, on the interpretation of which our present controversy with the Amír has arisen. Whether the reading of that agreement, as stated by the writer of the article in the *Times* of September 8th, is a correct reading, the public have no means of judging, the text of the agreement having been kept secret for upwards of two years and only

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

recently published in its original form, without the several alterations subsequently made in its terms being indicated. On November 18th, 1894, the *Times* contained a telegram from its Calcutta Correspondent saying:

"The Amír has agreed to consider Chitral, Bajaur, Swat and the neighbouring States of Indus Kohistan, as without the sphere of his influence."

This, however, is merely an irresponsible interpretation of a text to which the public has not access. We cannot, therefore, ascertain its accuracy.

As regards the probability of the Bajaur controversy leading to war between us and Afghanistan, it is not unreasonable to expect that the Amír will consent to make some concessions rather than invalidate an agreement which secures to him a subsidy of 1,800,000 rupees a year. But a more complete view of the situation is obtained when we bear in mind the respective motives by which the two Governments are actuated in their dealings with each other. The settled policy of the British is to exercise dominion over Afghanistan, professedly for the defence of our Indian possessions against Russia. Such dominion, however, can be obtained only when Afghanistan has been conquered, and is securely held, by British troops. The Amír's policy, on the other hand, is to protect the country of the Afghan tribes against the encroachments of all infidels. From that duty, which he accepted solemnly, as he fearlessly proclaimed to us, he is not likely to recede, since by receding he would at once forfeit sovereignty, life, and all that is dear to him in the world. From these premises it seems safe to conclude that, whatever be the immediate outcome of the Mittai valley incident, a collision and a struggle between the two parties—the one striving for supremacy, the other for independence—cannot long be delayed. Accordingly both parties seem intent upon preparing to meet that contingency.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The annual dinner of the London Indian Society, held at the Holborn Restaurant on September 4th, was a brilliant success. The date was fixed by the birthday of the President, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who was born in Bombay, on September 4th, 1825, and who received a remarkable ovation both from the members of the Society and from the many Englishmen who were present. Unfortunately neither Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., nor Mr. A. O. Hume was able to attend. Letters were read from them, and from Mr. H. J. Reynolds, Mr. Herbert Roberts, M.P., Mr. Wadia, and Mr. Seymour Keay. A novel feature in the dinner was a course of "national Indian dishes," which added considerably to the warmth of the proceedings.

Mr. Naoroji, proposing the first toast, "The Empress of India and the Royal Family," said Her Majesty's great proclamation of 1858 was a landmark of civilisation as well as a landmark in the history of India. It was the hope and anchor of the people, and if the expectations raised by it had been disappointed it was the fault of the Executive, and not of the Sovereign. (Cheers.) Mr. W. S. Caine, asking his hearers to drink to "India and the Indian National Congress," said he would soon pay his fourth visit to India in order to be present for the third time at the Congress, where he was to represent the British Committee. No influence during the last ten years could be compared with that of the Congress, for it had drawn Englishmen and Indians together in bonds of union and sympathy to a marvellous extent. (Cheers.) The first time he visited India the Anglo-Indian newspapers were full of abuse of the Congress, but now their tone was entirely different. The feeling here also had changed, in consequence of the work of the British Committee of the Congress, which had set itself to permeat the press with the truth concerning the just aspirations of India for a share in her own government. (Cheers.) Knowing, however, that the battle would have to be fought in this country, he regretted that the number of members of the House of Commons willing to help India had fallen from 185 in the last Parliament to 120 at present, but he believed that the figure would rise again at the next general election. (Cheers.)

Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, vice-president of the Society, responded, indignantly repudiating the suggestion that because Indians demanded a share in their own government they were disloyal. "We Indians," he said, "are one nation." Mr. H. N. Haridas, who also replied, declared that the friends of India had convinced disinterested public opinion in this country that with regard to the cotton duties the interests of poor India had been sacrificed by the present Government for the sake of an electioneering triumph.

Among the most notable speeches of the evening were Mr. Naoroji's (in reply to the toast of his health), Professor A. F. Murison's (replying for the guests), and Dr. Moncure D. Conway's. Mr. Naoroji, who declared that he had not a harsh word to say of Englishmen, was evidently touched by the spontaneous demonstration of gratitude and goodwill which he received. His sincerity, his earnestness, and his perseverance were the theme of every speaker, and the Grand Old Man of India beamed with honest, and touching, pride. Professor Murison, citing the example of Prince Ranjitsinhji and others, said that the royal road to an Englishman's respect was to beat him at something. Dr. Conway delivered an eloquent and thoughtful speech on the debt of European nations to Oriental philosophy and asceticism. The other speakers included Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. H. Morgan-Browne, Mr. H. Budruddin Tyabji, Mr. T. J. Desai, and Mr. Syed Z. A. Balkhi.

The Blue-book promised by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure still remains to be issued. It was laid in "dummy" on the Table of the House of Commons before the prorogation, and was expected

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to be in members' hands before the end of August. The volume will, it is anticipated, contain some important documents on financial subjects in addition to the first section of the evidence.

We understand that Sir Charles Elliott will contribute to the October number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* an article upon "Executive and Judicial Powers in India." From the tone of Sir Charles's previous declarations upon this subject, it may perhaps be inferred that his article will be of value chiefly to his opponents. Dr. K. N. Bahadurji will contribute to the same number an article upon "The Medical Needs of India."

The volume in which the Czar records the impressions of his Eastern travels contains a passage which, in the opinion of the *Daily News* reviewer, might have been written by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Discussing the condition of Western India, the Czar writes:—

"Formerly money used, at times, to be exacted beyond all measure from the population, but it remained in India; now the taxation is seemingly lighter and more humane, yet the wealth of the country is slowly failing, or being transferred to foreign lands, which draw the life-blood from the passive East, flooding it with the worst products of their industry, and slowly undermining the general prosperity of the natives, who to the superficial eye seem to be happy and contented, and preserved from their former internecine disturbances. Let me illustrate this by an example. The Gaekwar of Baroda, when occupying a more independent position, used annually to purchase from Ahmedabad some £30,000 worth of silk and cloth alone. From the time that the splendour of this Maratha prince began to fade the Merchants of Gujarat found themselves losing ground. Some of the cleverest artisans remain quite without work, or earn only a bare pittance."

We understand that Miss C. S. Bremner, whose name is familiar to readers of India, is at present engaged upon a work dealing with the education of women and girls in Great Britain. The book is to be published by Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein this autumn. Strange to say, the field is unoccupied, no such work having yet been attempted. Miss Bremner deals with primary, secondary, higher, and "technico-professional" education. Mr. G. Alexander and Miss Jane Galloway, of Glasgow, will be responsible for the chapter on Scottish education, and Miss E. P. Hughes, of the Cambridge Training College, will contribute the preface.

In the School of Modern Oriental Studies at the Imperial Institute the successful candidates for the Ouseley scholarships for 1896 were as follows: Burmese, Lee Ah Yain; Arabic, G. Sarwar; Marathi, V. R. Pandit. Three Ouseley scholarships of £50 per annum, tenable for two years, will be awarded in July next, should sufficient merit be shown, for proficiency in Tamil, Persian, and Chinese. In the event of there being no candidates for any of these subjects, Gujarati will be substituted. The limits of age for competitors are 21–25.

"There was trouble at the India Office last week," wrote the *St. James's Gazette* on September 15th. "It was feared at one time that the Secretary of State's Council would be unable to meet on Wednesday. Lord George Hamilton, who is President by virtue of his post, is, of course, away; but it is customary for the Vice-President to remain within hail. Sir Alfred Lyall, however, who is Vice-President for the year, had gone into the country, trusting that enough members were left in town to form the necessary quorum. Then Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart went on the sick-list, and the prospects of a meeting grew extremely doubtful. A telegram was sent to Sir Alfred Lyall begging him to come back; but he declared it was out of the question, and the Clerk of the Council, Sir Horace Walpole, was in despair. As a last resource, Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who is taking the regulation holiday, was appealed to, and not in vain. He returned, not perhaps with cheerful alacrity, but in time for the meeting. Strong opinions are expressed on the grave inconvenience that may arise from reducing the number of Councillors without at the same time reducing the quorum." A more excellent way, we suggest, would be to abolish the India Council altogether as an obsolete and unprofitable institution.

We should like to draw the attention of our readers to the publication of the *Progressive Review*, the first number of which appeared on September 25th. The Review is established, we learn, to secure an effective presentation, and a vigorous and rational defence of modern progressive thought, particularly in the sphere of politics. "The promoters feel that the inadequacy of the support given at present to movements aiming at social and political reform is largely due to the fact that these movements, owing to the rise of new problems in politics and economics, are but imperfectly explained and understood. The Review will not be a party organ, but will confine itself to a statement and defence of the principles which must now guide the progressive movement, and will examine how far and by what means they can be applied to existing social conditions. The articles will therefore deal with the fundamental principles of democratic government and of industrial development as well as with the chief matters of current public interest." We trust that Indian questions will receive adequate attention in the pages of this enterprising publication.

If the *Times* cannot boast "the largest circulation in the world" it can, perhaps, claim the most unique. The following is from a recent issue:

"The Circulation of the 'Times'.—A correspondent has received from India the following extract from the *Englishman* of Calcutta, dated August 14, 1896, and sends it to us for publication: 'The sailors of the ship "Somali" when off the Cape of Good Hope the other day caught a shark—a fine specimen, and on opening it up, as is the custom amongst seafaring men, discovered a complete copy of the *Times* in the brute's body.'"

This incident may be said to demonstrate anew the shark's capacity to swallow (if not to digest) anything.

The "India," the latest and finest addition to the Peninsular and Oriental fleet, arrived in the Thames on September 17th, after a trial trip, in which the highest expectations of the builders and owners are said to have been fully realised. The steamer touching at Plymouth on her way south, some of the guests left her there. Amongst the larger portion proceeding to London were Lord Davey, Sir Francis Jeune, Mr. John Aird, M.P., Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Sir Edward Hill, M.P., Sir Andrew Clarke, Mr. Carson, M.P., and Sir Wemyss Reid.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1896.

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT, 1896.

COMMENTING on Mr. Hanbury's motion of March 14th last year, to the effect that the military appropriations in aid paid by India were excessive and unjust, the *Globe* wrote: "The present Parliamentary Session ought to be favourably recorded "by the future historian as that in which the "British conscience first began to show uneasiness "about 'injustice to India'." This unexpected tribute to the growing importance of Indian questions in the House of Commons was not, of course, strictly accurate. Even before 1895 the "British conscience," stimulated by the energy of a handful of independent members, had begun to regard an Indian debate as something other than a nuisance or a soporific. The same stimulus has been at work during the Session which ended a few weeks ago. The Indian Parliamentary Committee, which now consists of 120 members of the House of Commons, has not, indeed, accomplished all that it proposed. Still less has it achieved all that the taxpayers of India could desire. It has not brought the Front Benches to admit the overwhelming importance of the demands put forward by educated opinion in India, nor has it, in every case, successfully enforced its equitable objections to the policy proposed by the Government. But, in the teeth of obstacles that cannot be fully appreciated by anybody who is not familiar with the inside of the House of Commons, it has done an immense amount of useful work, and work, too, which, but for its spontaneous efforts, would never have been attempted. The initiative and persistence of Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., loyally supported by the colleagues who have enrolled themselves as members of his gallant force, have secured for the voteless taxpayers of India a hearing in Parliament, and an opportunity of protest and remonstrance, on many important occasions during the past Session. In the House of Commons there have been no fewer than five debates on questions of vital importance to India. Three of these debates were brought on solely by the good offices of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, while its members contributed to the other discussions speeches which, from the standpoint of the Indian taxpayers, were of unique importance and value. The Parliamentary Report which is issued month by month as a Supplement to "INDIA" contains, for the past Session, no fewer than 111 closely printed pages. Mere volume of discussion is, of course, neither here nor there. But no candid reader of these Reports will deny that substantial issues have been raised, or that the great bulk of the non-official speeches are to be placed to the credit of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. Nor was it only in the longer debates that Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues rendered useful service. From the beginning of the Session to its close they did not cease to cross-examine the Secretary of State by means of Parliamentary questions, and to secure publicity for important facts through the medium of Parliamentary Papers. The attention which Parliament devotes to Indian affairs is still ludicrously inadequate alike in amount and in kind. But if the Indian Parliamentary Committee were not in existence, or, being in existence, were less vigilant, the neglect of India by Parliament would be far grosser even than it is.

The first important debate of the Session took place on February 17th, on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment to the Address. The Queen's Speech announced that the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral had been successful. Sir W. Wedderburn proposed to add to the address in reply an expression of regret that the Government, reversing the policy of its predecessors, had decided not to withdraw from Chitral. The policy of retention, his amendment declared, violated the pledge expressly given by Lord Elgin, while it added dangerously to the trans-frontier responsibilities of the Government of India and the military

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

burdens of the Indian people. The amendment, which was seconded by Mr. Schwann, and supported in the division-lobby by 79 votes, provoked a remarkable speech from Lord George Hamilton. The Secretary of State actually declared that the only difficulty in regard to Lord Elgin's proclamation had arisen from the inconvenient anxiety of the native tribes to be incorporated in British territory. Perhaps he had forgotten this precious assertion when he said on August 13th that the relations between our officers and troops and the tribes were "steadily improving." Not less important was the discussion on Lord G. Hamilton's readjustment of the cotton duties, which Sir W. Wedderburn, by means of a motion for the adjournment of the House, succeeded in obtaining on May 18th. Before the debate came on the Indian Parliamentary Committee had circulated among members of Parliament a concise memorandum explaining the grounds of complaint and proposing a simple and effective remedy. Sir W. Wedderburn's motion, which was supported by nearly all the members of the Opposition with the exception of ex-Ministers, stated that the cotton duties, as re-arranged by Lord G. Hamilton, were causing grave dissatisfaction in India because they increased the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of consumers. Sir Henry Fowler made himself conspicuous in the discussion by an amazing attack upon the independent members of his own party, and something very like a defence of the Tory Minister who had first denounced and afterwards reversed his policy. If anything were needed to heighten the eccentricity of Sir H. Fowler's conduct on that occasion it would be found in the fact, subsequently disclosed in his speech on the Indian Budget, that he was nevertheless substantially in accord with the proposal put forward by the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The third debate for which Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues were immediately responsible had to do with the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar. On July 21st, Mr. Herbert Roberts asked and obtained leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to the Mahárájá's treatment at the hands of the Indian Government, and the unsatisfactory character of the enquiry into his case. It is interesting and instructive to note that the opportunity for these three debates—which undoubtedly made a useful impression on the House of Commons and the India Office—had to be obtained by their authors. The retention of Chitral, the inequitable readjustment of the cotton duties, and the condemnation of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar without trial would have been allowed to pass uncriticised, and Indian public opinion would have found no expression at Westminster, if the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee had not gone out of their way, in the teeth of many difficulties and discouragements, to create the occasion for discussion.

The two remaining debates of first-rate importance concerned the employment of Indian troops at Suakin (July 6th) and the Indian Budget (August 13th). The debate, and the preliminary questions, upon the "masterpiece of melancholy meanness," by which the indigent taxpayers of India were compelled to contribute to the cost of aggression in the Sudan, did not call for special activity on the part of the Indian Parliamentary Committee only because Mr. John Morley and others threw themselves with admirable vigour into the contest for justice and fair dealing. Mr. John Morley and his coadjutors were unsuccessful. But the Government's majority was reduced to eighty-five, and the Government would have been placed in a minority if the Cabinet had not staked its existence on the result of the division. The storm of indignation which the policy of Lord Salisbury and his colleagues excited in the House of Commons and in the country is a sufficient guarantee that this particular type of meanness will not be attempted again by any Government. The debate on the Indian Budget was examined at length in our last issue. This is the one opportunity automatically provided each year for the discussion of Indian questions. How absurdly inadequate it is Sir W. Wedderburn demonstrates once more in the article which we print on another page. The chief interest of the Budget discussion centred in his proposal to apply, with the necessary changes of detail, to the expenditure of India the methods of scrutiny which have been employed with excellent results in the case of the United Kingdom. It is quite certain that the proposal will be brought forward again at the first opportunity, when Lord George Hamilton and Sir Henry Fowler, if they have any respect for the House of Commons, will not seek to dismiss it with the flimsy irrelevance which they vouchsafed to it last August. Apart from the debates, the Secretary of State was subjected during the recent Session to a running fire of questions on many matters which have attracted attention in India. Among these may be mentioned the invasion of Kafiristan, the grave blunder of the "forward" school in respect of the Bashgal Valley, the position of British Indian subjects in South Africa, the rate of mortality in Indian prisons, the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers, the land revenue system in Madras, the fortification of the Malakand Pass, the right of interpellation, the creation of a Legislative Council for the Punjab, the re-settlements in Jabalpur, and the ravages of contagious disease among British troops in India. In estimating the value of debates and questions on Indian affairs in the House of Commons it is

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

necessary to take into account not merely the actual results achieved at the moment and in any particular case, but also the deterrent influence which the possibility of such scrutiny exercises upon a bureaucratic Government. "What's done we partly can "compute, But know not what's prevented." The Indian Parliamentary Committee has displayed admirable energy in turning to account the opportunities which are within its reach. But if the electors of the United Kingdom are to do their duty by their fellow-subjects in India, the opportunities of Parliamentary criticism will have to be improved and increased.

ANGLO-INDIAN CRIMINAL CASES.[1]

The first edition of this volume brought upon the author the distinction of a severe snub from Sir Charles Elliott, then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The Anglo-Indian Press endorsed the snub, and made merry over the victim. Probably, however, as usually happens in such cases, the effect was to help the author materially to sell off his first edition, and to give bold advertisement to the work and to its contents. It is easy to understand why officials of the Government of India should not like to see any aspersion cast upon the administration of justice. Obviously, however, it is not the compiler of cases of miscarriage of justice that is to blame. The blame must lie on the officials implicated. Babu Ram Gopal disclaims expressly "the smallest idea of "reflecting upon the character of Englishmen in "India as a class, or of traducing the Government "which has conferred such great benefits upon the "people of India." There is nothing to show that his disclaimer is in the slightest degree insincere. But even if it were—even if Babu Ram Gopal were a mischief-maker and detractor pure and simple—the essential point still would be, Does he state the actual facts? If he adheres to the actual facts, then he undoubtedly does good service.

Whatever may be the grounds for the complaint that in questions—and especially in criminal cases—between Europeans and Indians the administration did, or does, lean to the side of the European, it has certainly been a complaint made, and strongly made, by men who cannot be called irresponsible.

"It was made," says Babu Ram Gopal, "by Hurrish Chunder Mookerjee; it was repeated by Kristo Dass Pal; it is emphasised by men upon whom their mantle has fallen, by Indian journalists of all shades of religious and political opinion, by men like Sambhoo Chunder Mookerjee, Shishir Kumar Ghose, Narendra Nath Sen, and Surendra Nath Banerjea."

There is no good in telling us that such an outcry would be made apart from all reasonable grounds, and out of mere devilry. But the complaint once made, and once taken up by the public, the only sensible course seems to be to set forth the facts. "It was suggested so far back as 1883, in the first "National Congress that ever was held, that these "cases should be put together in the form of a book, "and an appeal made, on the strength of them, to "the consciences of the British people." The suggestion was manifestly practical and business-like. But this collection of Babu Ram Gopal's does not—could not possibly—appear under the authorisation of the National Congress. It is a private venture. Besides, its incompleteness is attributed—not altogether properly—by the compiler to his grievous lack of means. This is a pity, of course. The thing was worth doing, and therefore it was worth doing well. But we are not satisfied that Babu Ram Gopal, with all his industry and earnestness, was the right man to do it.

The Babu, we take it, is not a trained lawyer. That seems to us an all but insuperable disqualification. The compiler of such a book as this ought to be able to appreciate precisely the legal points involved in each case, and to strip off all matter that is not strictly relevant to the particular charge, and to set forth every relevant fact available. For example, a competent compiler would hardly allow himself to speak of "accidental murder" in a shooting excursion (p. 120); and, if he cited the general facts from a newspaper paragraph—as the Babu does—he would see the propriety of verifying them, and of stating with equal prominence the course and the results of judicial enquiry—which the Babu does not. The public, who are asked to constitute themselves a Court of Appeal, must be informed of the charge, the facts as given in evidence on both sides, and the verdict and sentence. The Babu falls grievously short in these requirements. This is very unfortunate. The English public are as anxious as the Babu himself that justice, spotless and even-handed, shall be meted out in India. They are willing to listen to him, and to raise their voices against injustice. But it is absolutely futile to place before them mere newspaper paragraphs, or incomplete statements from which they cannot possibly judge one way or another. If the Babu had sensibly excised all such cases as lack elements of cogency, even so much as to raise the slightest suspicion, he would have found space enough for the statement of many cases whose absence from his pages he deplores. The Babu, to put it frankly, must study the elements of legal proof.

The subject is important, far beyond the claims of

[1] "The Record of Criminal Cases, as between Europeans and Natives for the last Hundred Years." Edited and published by Ram Gopal Sanyal. Enlarged second edition. Calcutta: Printed by Sanyal and Co. at the Bharata Mihir Press. 1896. Rs. 2.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the present volume. It is all the more necessary for us to see more particularly what the volume alleges, and how far its allegations are valid. We, at least, shall not be suspected of any desire to shield wrong-doers from righteous exposure and just punishment. At the same time, we can be no parties to reckless accusation, or vague aspersion, however well-meant. What we are concerned to get at is the actual truth in the matter, and the real significance of the truth. Babu Ram Gopal's first instalment of cases stretches from 1807 to 1860. He extracts 30 cases from the defunct *Hurkaru* and the *Friend of India*, and he reprints the late Hon. Kristo Dass Pal's summary of 48 criminal cases from the *Hindu Patriot* of July 31, 1876—in all 78 cases. Now, let us look through the Babu's own 30 cases. They are all admittedly mere newspaper reports, wholly unverified; and even "the blessed *Amrita Bazar Patrika*" is not to be accepted as conclusive evidence of fact. But assuming the facts stated as absolutely true, what do we find? There are a dozen cases of acquittal, on various grounds; and in not a single case is there any fact stated to show why the acquittal was not right. There are half a dozen cases where punishment was awarded in ample measure; and another half dozen where the punishment awarded might be said to be inadequate, if we only knew the facts, but the facts are not given so as to enable us to form any opinion. The rest of the cases are incompletely stated, and ought not to have been printed. On this list, we should decline to say one word against the administration of justice in India. Take two or three examples:

"William Smith was arraigned . . . . for having murdered a woman . . . . but was acquitted on the ground of the unsatisfying nature of the evidence adduced against him."

"James Bedford was tried for slaughtering a native . . . . and was acquitted by the Grand Jury."

"The *Friend of India* . . . . says that Captain Campbell . . . . shot a fisherman. . . . He was acquitted on the plea that he was insane."

A civilian stabs a coolie, according to the *Friend of India*, when temporarily insane. "But," says the Babu, "a correspondent of the *Citizen* described it as a deliberate murder. What became of this case cannot be ascertained from the files of the *Friend*."

To produce such examples as these is enough to ruin the whole collection. To a lawyer, or to any level-headed person, they are utterly ludicrous. Every one of the cases the Babu cites may, indeed, be a gross perversion of justice. We cannot tell. He fails to adduce the facts necessary to satisfy us, or else he leaves the case in such a form as to compel us to decide against him. In the selection given by the late Hon. Kristo Dass Pal, there are some ugly cases certainly. But, for the purposes of the present volume, they are stated in far too condensed a form, and there is no means of testing the numerous assumptions involved in the succinct statement. This portion of Babu Ram Gopal's work seems to us, therefore, completely inefficient for its object.

For the years from 1860 to 1870, there are 17 cases given. The first is the case of John Rudd, who was hanged for shooting an Indian, and Babu Ram Gopal can only complain that an attempt was made to get a reprieve—such an attempt as we are familiar with in England, even in very gross and unquestionable cases of crime. In five or six other cases, in which the sentence is stated, the punishment seems to have been quite adequate. The case of Dawkins, who got six months' rigorous imprisonment "for shooting at and wounding two natives "whose boat fouled his," may seem a travesty of justice, if one were satisfied that the full statement of the facts is contained in the expression "whose "boat fouled his." We cannot join with the Babu in jeering at the plea of self-defence, unless he produce evidence to show its hollowness. Of the other cases we put aside those that are incompletely stated, and the only one that remains with any trace of suspicion about it is the case of Kally Churn (1867). If the Babu's facts be correct and complete, Kally Churn's assailant ought to have been hanged by the neck until dead, and not "honourably acquitted." Yet the very statement of the case tends to throw doubt on its accuracy and completeness.

There are 33 cases from 1870 to 1880. It is a deplorable thing, no doubt, that a Lieutenant-Colonel should have so far forgotten himself as to assault the distinguished novelist, Babu Bunkim Chunder Chatterjee. But the assailant "afterwards "apologized to him," and there was an end of the matter. A case like this ought to find no place in such a collection as the present. Again the Meares (Jessore planter's) case occupies just eight pages. Why? It ended in what the Babu himself calls a "just conviction" before the Magistrate, a conviction that was upheld, as the Babu narrates, by the High Court of Calcutta, and finally by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal (Sir Richard Temple), on appeal. What more can the Babu, or anybody else, want? There is not, there never was, there never will be, any country in this imperfect world, where such unfortunate occurrences will not take place. But when justice is done, there ought to be an end of the matter. Such a case as this, instead of throwing any aspersion on the administration of justice, glorifies it at every point; and as a mere incident in social life, it tells nothing that might not have been anticipated by the most careless observer of the world. There are two cases where a District Judge and a Sessions Judge are implicated in most regrettable ways. But both of them come disastrously to grief in the due course of justice. True,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the cases suggest a wider prevalence of the like sort of wrong-doing. But the inference is not justifiable; and at any rate justice was substantially meted out. Of course the case of Fuller's syce and Lord Lytton's famous Resolution thereon (1876) are given, and Babu Ram Gopal properly mentions the remonstrance of the High Court of the North-Western Provinces against the Resolution. It is futile to discuss the point afresh, but there can be no hesitation in endorsing Lord Lytton's condemnation of "European masters threatening their Native ser-"vants in a manner in which they would not treat "men of their own race." The case, however, show the Government passionately interested in justice to the Native. The like remarks apply to the Kuka executions and the Governor-General's condemnatory Resolution thereon (1872). In this division of the book there are perhaps half-a-dozen cases of real importance, which ought to be set out fully: the Sylhet case (1872), the Stevens case (1875), the Pleader's ear-pulling case in Sylhet (1877), the Fenuah case (1877), Dookha Guri's case (1877), and the Lokenathpore case (1878). In every one of these there are elements that demand exposure.

It is unnecessary to go through the remaining third part of the volume in detail. The conclusions would be precisely similar. The industry and earnestness of Babu Ram Gopal might well be utilised by some editor who understands these things better than the Babu. Incidentally, we may add, the cases furnish evidence against the obnoxious union of executive and judicial functions, and they throw interesting side-lights upon the willing and effective helpfulness of an experienced lawyer like Mr. Manomohan Ghose in circumstances where the unassisted Indian would have undoubtedly suffered grievous injustice. Why is there not some strong association for the investigation and prosecution of such cases of real importance? It is humiliating to think that such an association should be necessary.

WILLIAM MORRIS.[1]

POETRY and wall-papers, chairs and printed books, tapestries and illuminated manuscripts, socialistic speeches and philippics against architectural restoration—diverse indeed are the manifestations of the versatile genius of William Morris. In all of them, however, is to be traced the same intensity of aesthetic feeling, now stimulated and enraptured by some loveliness in nature or art or antiquity, now chafed and fretted by the hideous vulgarity of so much of our boasted civilisation. The ugliness of our modern life seems from the first to have vexed him like a nightmare. He sought relief from it in the art of the Middle Ages, and persuaded himself—not unreasonably, one would think—that the ages that produced such art could not have been so dark as we are apt to suppose. "Time was"—he said in an address delivered at Burslem in 1881, and behind the voice of the disciple we seem to hear the voice of the master, Mr. Ruskin—

"When everybody that made anything made a work of art besides a useful piece of goods, *and it gave them pleasure to make it.* Whatever I doubt, I have no doubt of that. And, sirs, if there is anything in the business of my life worth doing, if I have any worthy aspiration, it is the hope that I may help to bring about the day when we shall be able to say—'So it was once, so it is now.' Do not misunderstand me; I am not a mere praiser of past times. I know that in those days of which I speak, life was often rough and evil enough, beset by violence, superstition, ignorance, slavery; yet I cannot help thinking that sorely as poor folks needed a solace, they did not altogether lack one, and that solace was pleasure in their work. Ah, sirs, much as the world has won since then, I do not think it has won for all men such perfect happiness that we can afford to cast aside any solace that nature holds forth to us."

In a later address, published in 1888 in "Signs of "Change," we find him saying:

"As I strove to stir up people to this reform, I found that the causes of the vulgarities of civilisation lay deeper than I had thought, and little by little I was driven to the conclusion that all these uglinesses are but the outward expression of the innate moral baseness into which we are forced by our present form of society, and that it is futile to attempt to deal with them from the outside."

How anyone can be forced into *innate* baseness by any external conditions whatever it is difficult to understand. The mere use of such an expression is enough to suggest the conclusion that Mr. Morris's logical faculty is not as strongly developed as his artistic taste. Or if this seems too brutal a way of putting it, he will at least forgive us for addressing him in the words of another Victorian poet:

"Not here, O Apollo,
Are haunts meet for thee,
But where Helicon breaks down
In cliff to the sea."

It is not because we would have the singer nothing but "the idle singer of an empty day," that we address him thus. It is because "there are diversities of gifts;" and Mr. Morris has many, far more than most men, but not all. In art, not in political controversy, his genius finds its true scope; and his influence through his art, whatever discouragements he may have met, has been indisputably great and wide.

Mr. Morris's chief poems have now been before the world for a good many years; and it ought to be possible to estimate their value with a greater approach to accuracy than at the time of their

[1] "The Earthly Paradise: A Poem." By William Morris. New Edition. 1896. (London and Bombay: Longmans.)
[1] "The Life and Death of Jason: A Poem." By William Morris. Eighth Edition, revised by the Author. 1896. (Longmans.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

original publication, though the ultimate verdict belongs to posterity, and not to this generation at all. A poet's contemporaries can never fix his place in the final class-list; but, after a reasonable lapse of time, they ought to be able to decide whether he is worthy to be passed on for the re-consideration of posterity or deserves to be buried out of hand. There is little doubt that Mr. Morris, in spite of the length of his epics, which, as the wealth of the world's poetry accumulates, must tell heavily against a poet's chances of immortality, will have to appear before a later tribunal than that of his contemporaries.

The first of his claims to re-consideration will probably be his power of story-telling. He is not uniformly successful; or, perhaps, it were truer to say that he does not suit in every mood. There are times when the strong simplicity, the few swift vivid strokes of the original story of "The Writing "on the Image" in the *Gesta Romanorum* impress us far more forcibly than the linked sweetness long drawn-out of the version in "The Earthly Paradise"; times when we are almost inclined to remind our poet of the French proverb, that the secret of wearying is to tell everything. Yet if we are in the true listener's mood, if (as the vulgar nineteenth-century would say) "time is no object," what a charming story-teller he is! What a wonderful procession of beautiful pictures passes before our eyes in "The Life and Death of Jason," luring us on through all the seventeen books into which he has expanded the "Argonautica" of Apollonius Rhodius! It is curious, by the way, that he should have chosen to adapt the work of this particular poet, and thereby have confirmed, in a sense, a comparison that would inevitably have suggested itself to scholars quite independently. For Apollonius, writing in Alexandria in a literary age, when poetry had become an artificial thing, and poets strove by learned elaboration to reproduce the style of the earlier epics, stood in very much the same relation to Homer as that in which William Morris stands to Chaucer. In each case the imitator fails with all his striving to "recapture the first fine careless "rapture" of his model. But it is easy to press the charge of artificiality too far. No one can read Mr. Morris's "Jason" sympathetically without feeling that he has caught a great deal of the Homeric and Chaucerian quality of "naïf wonder." No one can read "The Story of Sigurd the Volsung" without feeling that he has even caught much of the swiftness and fire and dignity that we have been taught to regard as the Homeric qualities *par excellence*. There is surely the true Homeric ring in such lines as these:—

"And dead he fell, thrust backward, and rang on the dead men's gear,
But still for a certain season durst no man draw anear:
For 'twas e'en as a great God's slaying, and they feared the wrath of the sky,
And they deemed their hearts might harden if awhile they should let him lie."

It is Mr. Morris's language that is most open to the charge of artificiality—his choice of obsolete expressions, his very limited vocabulary (from which nearly all words of classical origin are excluded), his use of fixed epithets, as "wan water." But, these mannerisms notwithstanding, his language seems to be in the main sincere. Nobody would seriously wish to impose the narrow limitations of Mr. Morris's vocabulary on other writers, but to Mr. Morris himself those limitations are perfectly natural. He has made for himself a world out of the old Scandinavian literature, and so completely has he inhaled the atmosphere of the world he has thus created for himself, that he belongs spiritually to that world and not to nineteenth century England. Dante Rossetti, by his sympathy with the times of his great Italian namesake, did something of the same kind for himself. If proof were needed of Mr. Morris's sincerity, it seems to be forthcoming in the fact that, as an American critic, Mr. Stedman, says, his language offers no resisting medium to interfere with our enjoyment of his tales.

But besides his great narrative gift Mr. Morris has another high poetic quality. Through all his verse comes surging "the Virgilian cry, the sense of tears in mortal things." That peculiar touch of pathos has seldom been given better in modern poetry than in these lines from the prologue to "The Earthly Paradise":—

"Sirs, ye are old, and ye have seen perchance
Some little child for very gladness dance
Over a scarcely-noticed worthless thing,
Worth more to him than ransom of a king.
Did not a pang of more than pity take
Your heart thereat, not for the youngling's sake,
But for your own, for man that passes by,
So like to God, so like the beasts that die?—
Lo, Sirs, my pity for myself is such,
When like an image that my hand can touch
My old self grows unto myself grown old.
Sirs, I forget, my story is not told."

Virgil—as Mr. Mackail has said so truly and so well in his history of Latin literature—lived in the world that the Greek and Latin poets had created, but looked out of it into another. It is to that other world, the world of romance, that Mr. Morris wholly belongs. He has "caught the spirit of those "generations," to quote Mr. Stedman again, "which "scarcely emerged from classicism in the South, "and bordered by heathendom on the North, peopled "their unhallowed places with beings drawn from "either source. Christ reigned, yet the old gods had "not wholly faded out, but acted, whether fair or

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"devilish, as subjects and allies of Satan." As you read you feel yourself transported into the dim twilight atmosphere of some magical land peopled with phantoms; the air is full of mysterious presences, unseen yet more real and powerful than the shadowy forms of the men and women. For, in truth, "The Earthly Paradise" is like the magic bower in Burne Jones's wonderful pictures of "The "Legend of the Briar Rose." Beauty and colour are there, rich beauty and gorgeous colour, but no life save the life subtly felt, one knows not how, of unseen presences looking on. Over the faces of all the men and women is cast the spell of a lengthy sleep; the air is full of a soundless music that seems to whisper "death"; and the spectator half shudders lest the spell should creep over him too, and he, like the rest, should fade into the shadow of a dream.

"They entered: like a town of ghosts it seemed
To Walter, a beleaguered town of ghosts;
And he felt of them, little though he dreamed
Amid his pain of all the marshalled hosts
That lay there buried mid forgotten boasts:
But dead he seemed, as those his pleasures were,
Dead in a prison vast and void and drear."
—(Walter in Rome—"The Hill of Venus.")

But with his mystical temper Mr. Morris unites a vivid sympathy with Nature, and over against his shadowy pictures of the life of past generations, veiled in an atmosphere of dim romance, we may set his fresh bright living landscapes. The description of the mill in "The Man born to be King" is a good example. The stanzas on the months in "The "Earthly Paradise" have something of the felicity of Shakespeare's peerless sonnets, "Shall I compare "thee to a summer's day?" or "That time of year "thou mayst in me behold."

When all these splendid qualities have been enumerated, there still remains the ungracious but inevitable question, Has Mr. Morris any positive defect that hinders him from taking a really high place, not merely among the poets of his own generation, but among the poets whose work endures the test of time? The sources of strength and weakness often lie close together. Mr. Morris's deep instinct for beauty gives to his verse its peculiar charm, but its exclusive predominance is responsible for the faults of his poetry and of his criticism of life. It produces in the former a cloying excess of sweetness, whilst it renders the latter feeble and hopeless. To him, as to his Wanderers, life is an unsolved riddle:—

"Lo,
A long life gone, and nothing more they know
Why they should live to have desire and foil,
And toil that, overcome, brings yet more toil,
Than that day of their vanished youth, when first
They saw Death clear, and deem'd all life accurst
By that cold overshadowing threat,—the End."

The only advice he has to offer seems to be that contained in the song which Psyche hears sung by mysterious voices:

"Ah, little ones, but if ye could forget
Amidst your outpoured love that you must die,
Then ye, my servants, were death's conquerors yet,
And love to you should be eternity,
How quick soever might the days go by:
Yes, ye are made immortal on the day
Ye cease the dusty grains of time to weigh."

"Forget death, if you can, and enjoy the present." It is not a very noble philosophy; and the poet knows that he cannot take his own advice. The shadow of death broods over all his "Earthly "Paradise"; he cannot forget it. Still less can he face it in the spirit of the great poets and painters, whose most precious gift to us has been this—that they have taught us how to meet death unfalteringly, bestowing upon us a measure of their own high courage and confident calm. Sophocles in his "Oedipus at Colonus," Plato (dramatic artist as well as philosopher) in his "Phaedo," Wordsworth in his "Methought I saw the footsteps of a throne," Mr. G. F. Watts in his "Love and Death," have all a loftier message of the things that pertain unto our peace. And if it should be objected that our demand is too exacting, that poetry has leave to be purely decorative and to offer no criticism of life at all, we may assent willingly, but not to the extent of admitting that the poetry that gives no criticism of life ranks as high as the poetry that teaches and consoles. The art that is to be (in a noble phrase of Mr. J. A. Symonds) "permanent and fresh and "satisfying through a hundred generations, to yield "the bread and wine of daily sustenance for men "and women in successive ages," must be something more than merely decorative. But no juster criticism of Mr. Morris's work has been written than this from his own pen:—

"Of Heaven or Hell I have no power to sing,
I cannot ease the burden of your fears,
Or make quick-coming death a little thing,
Or bring again the pleasure of past years;
Nor for my words shall ye forget your tears,
Or hope again for aught that I can say,
The idle singer of an empty day.

"Dreamer of dreams, born out of my due time,
Why should I strive to set the crooked straight?
Let it suffice me that my murmuring rhyme
Beats with light wing against the ivory gate,
Telling a tale not too importunate
To those who in the sleepy region stay,
Lulled by the singer of an empty day."

What need is there of a graver indictment or a more winning apology?

The Royal Commission on the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland recently issued their final report. Indian readers will not fail to note the methods which have been adopted in order to estimate relative capacity to bear taxation, and may well apply these methods, *mutatis mutandis*, and the conclusions that they suggest, to the case of the Indian taxpayers.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

THE POSITION OF BRITISH INDIANS.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONERS.

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

The attention of our readers is directed to the following highly important correspondence with reference to the rights of British Indians in regard to the Civil Service of the United Kingdom. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whose vigilance on behalf of his fellow-countrymen is unceasing, has, it will be seen, succeeded in establishing conclusions of great significance and value.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
31st May, 1896.

Sir,—I shall feel much obliged by your giving me the following information.

The qualification for a candidate for the Examinations for the Civil Service of India is "(1) that he is a natural-born subject of her Majesty."

Similarly the qualification for a candidate for the Examinations for the Civil Services of the United Kingdom is: "(3), These examinations are open, under such general restrictions as may be laid down, to all natural-born subjects of her Majesty."

If so, am I right in considering that the Examinations for the Civil Services of the United Kingdom are fully open to Indians, just as much as to the British-born subjects?

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

J. S. Lockhart, Esq.,
Secretary and Reg., Civil Service Commission,
Cannon Row, Westminster, S.W.

In reply to the above letter, the Secretary to the Civil Service Commission forwarded to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji a paper containing the regulations in respect of "Examinations held under the direction of the Civil Service Commissioners," at the same time directing Mr. Naoroji's attention to section 4 of the "General Notices" contained in that paper, as follows:—

4. NATIONALITY.—A person born in a foreign country who can prove that his father or his paternal grandfather was born in British Dominions, is, if he has not expatriated himself under the Naturalisation Act of 1870, admissible as a natural-born British subject to all open competitions which he is in other respects qualified to enter, except those for Student Interpreterships. For these he needs the permission of the Foreign Secretary. Naturalised aliens are admissible to compete for Home Civil Service appointments.

Thereupon the correspondence proceeded as follows:—

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
5th June, 1896.

Dear Sir,—I am very much obliged to you for sending me a copy of the paper for the "Examinations held under the direction of the Civil Service Commissioners" and for directing my attention to section 4 about "Nationalities."

I hope you will kindly excuse me for troubling you again. I understand from the section that the Indians come under the definition of a "natural-born British subject," because British Dominions (in which the Candidate or his father, or his grandfather should have been born) include India. The reason I am obliged to ask this is, that in the Regulations for the Indian Civil Service the words used are "a natural-born subject" and in the paper you have been good enough to send me, the words are "a natural-born British subject."

I shall therefore be much obliged if you would kindly explain whether the difference in the words means any actual difference, or that these words mean the same thing as the definition in section 4 describes and that the Native of India is admissible as "a natural-born British subject"?

May I ask the favour of a copy of the Regulations for Examinations of the Engineer Students in the Navy?

Yours truly
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

J. S. Lockhart Esq.,
Civil Service Commission,
Cannon Row, Westminster, S.W.

Civil Service Commission,
12th June, 1896.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to transmit the enclosed regulations and to state that natural-born subjects of Her Majesty are eligible in respect of nationality to compete for both the Home Civil Service and the Civil Service of India.

If you have any doubt as to your nationality you would probably do well to obtain a legal opinion on the subject.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) J. S. LOCKHART.

D. Naoroji Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
14th June, 1896.

Sir,—I thank you for your letter of the 12th inst. giving me the information I wanted.

In the paper you sent me before, I find that it begins with "General Notices" and in section 4 about "Nationality" I find the words admissible "to all open competitions." I shall feel further obliged if you would kindly inform me whether I am right in understanding that the "General Notices" apply to all the examinations held under the Civil Service Commissioners, including the military and navy.

I remain, your obedient servant,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Secretary.
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

Civil Service Commission,
19th June, 1896.

Sir,—With reference to your letter of the 14th inst., I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to state that the "General Notices" to which you refer may be regarded as applicable generally to all open competitive examinations held by this Board for situation in the Civil Service.

Examinations for commissions in the army are held under regulations issued by the War Office, and examinations for cadetships in the navy under regulations issued by the Admiralty.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) JOHN HENNELL.

D. Naoroji, Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road, S.W.,
2nd August, 1896.

Sir,—Thanking you for your letter of 19th of June last, may I request the favour of some further explanation.

In your above letter you were good enough to inform me that:—

> "The 'General Notices' to which you refer may be regarded as applicable generally to all open competitive examinations held by this Board for situation in the Civil Service,"

and further,

> "Examinations for commissions in the army are held under regulations issued by the War Office, and examinations for cadetships in the navy under regulations issued by the Admiralty."

May I ask whether I am right in understanding that "all open competitive examinations" held by the Civil Service Commissioners for "situation in the Civil Service," include all examinations for all departments of the War Office and the Admiralty, *excepting* only the examinations for "commissions in the army" and for "cadetships in the navy"?

I remain, your obedient servant,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Secretary,
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Civil Service Commission.
5th August, 1896.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 2nd instant, I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to state that whilst the great majority of the Clerkships in the Admiralty and War Office are filled by Open Competitive Examinations, the Tables mentioned at the head of the enclosed circular specify various other situations in both these departments which are filled by nomination. In cases where situations are filled by nomination, the functions of the Civil Service Commissioners are limited to examining the candidates officially nominated to them; they can give no information as to the persons from whom or the means by which nominations may be obtained.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
(Signed) J. S. LOCKHART.

D. Naoroji, Esq.

Cambridge Lodge, West Hill Road,
Southfields, S.W.
26th August, 1896.

Sir,—I have received your letter of yesterday.

I have to request you to communicate to the Civil Service Commissioners my sincere thanks for so readily giving me all the information I asked from them in my correspondence.

I am, your obdt. servant,
(Signed) DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Secretary,
Civil Service Commission, London, S.W.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND LORD WOLSELEY.

The statements and opinions put forward by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on July 29th, when Lord Wolseley was giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, have been grossly and ludicrously misrepresented in certain quarters; we set out below, therefore, the full report of that day's proceedings so far as Mr. Naoroji had any share in them.

Mr. Naoroji first intervened when Lord Wolseley stated that "his idea with regard to the charges generally for the troops in India was that India should pay for everything connected with the army." "I say," Lord Wolseley declared, "supposing we had no British Empire and no British rule in India to be maintained, we should not have those batteries and these fortifications, and consequently, as we have India, and we have these batteries, India should pay for them." The report proceeds as follows:

13,188. Mr. NAOROJI: But is it not for the sake of maintaining the British rule that all this British army and British fortifications and all these are there?—Lord WOLSELEY: No; it is for the purpose——

13,189. If British rule were not there you would not care a straw for India and would not go there?—Quite.

13,190. And you would not impose a British army upon India?—We do not impose a British army upon India; India asks for it.

13,191. You have a large European army imposed upon India for the purpose of maintaining British rule?—Why do you use the word "imposed"?

13,192. Because it is not with our consent; we have no voice; India has no voice?—That is a point I cannot go into.

The phrase "Indian requirements" being frequently employed, Mr. Naoroji again intervened:

13,243. Mr. NAOROJI: When you use the phrase that "India requires" or "when India's emergency takes place" what do you mean? It is not India that requires these troops annually; properly speaking is it not Great Britain that requires these troops there to maintain her own rule there; otherwise India would not require any troops from you?—Lord WOLSELEY: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

13,244. Mr. NAOROJI: Is it not for British purposes?—Lord WOLSELEY: I hope you will excuse me and pardon me, but that is a subject I cannot go into.

13,245. Mr. NAOROJI: It is rather unfair that repeatedly the expression is used "India's wants and India's requirements," and that these things are required in India's interests, when in reality it is all British interests, British wants, British purposes, in order to maintain British rule in India and nothing from England can ever be required.

Mr. JACKSON: But surely that assumes that the British rule in India is of no value to India.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is of value to India, but it is of value to Great Britain also.

Mr. JACKSON: Then, if it is of value to India, it is for India's requirements, India's interests, India's wants.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is for Britain also. Whatever is necessary for British rule should be supplied by Britain just as well as India. Is there not equal benefit, is there not benefit to both? This is all upon the supposition that it is all for the benefit of India, and Britain has simply nothing but a Quixotic and philanthropic purpose, for which it comes to India and saves India from Russian aggression.

13,246. Mr. JACKSON: I do not understand the argument?—Lord WOLSELEY: I cannot follow the argument, but I would merely say that my views are that India never existed as India at all until we went there. She was merely an agglomeration of tiny little States, the Muhammadans cutting the throats of the Hindus, with constant and continual internal troubles. India has been constituted an empire by us; everything that India has got at the present moment that is worth having has been derived from English rule. That is the only commentary I have to make as regards what Mr. Naoroji has to say.

Mr. NAOROJI: I had better say a few words afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: I think we must bear in mind that the English rule exists in India, and that it is not within the scope of our enquiry to go into the question of what would follow the removal of that rule or what would happen if that rule had never existed.

Mr. NAOROJI: That question arises from the kind of remarks that are made; otherwise I confine myself to expenditure when I come to it.

Later, Lord Wolseley said: "I saw one Eurasian regiment, and I never saw a more wretched, useless, or miserable body of men in my life. I saw them during the Mutiny; they would not fight, they were always grumbling, they did nothing." The report continues:

13,384. Mr. NAOROJI: Our object in this Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country in matters in which both are interested. You say England has done so much for India, but India must pay every farthing. Now let me read you a short statement?—Lord WOLSELEY: I cannot answer anything connected with the political condition of India. I am here to give you purely military opinions and answer purely military questions.

13,385. Sir DONALD STEWART: May I ask one question about the army medical establishment. Have you got any views upon the subject of the amalgamation of the two branches of the branches of the army medical service, the Indian and the British?—Lord WOLSELEY: Yes, I think that would be a saving for India; I think it is a pity it is not done.

13,386. CHAIRMAN: Amalgamation of the two services?—To have only one medical service for India would be a saving to India and it would not hurt us, according to my notions.

13,387. Sir DONALD STEWART: It would not disturb the efficiency?—According to my notion it would not.

13,388. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Naoroji, you heard what Lord Wolseley said. Of course it is for you to consider whether your questions go outside the line upon which you can expect him to give an answer.

Mr. NAOROJI: I have to put questions within our Commission's reference, and I should have answers from Lord Wolseley just as he thinks proper; but my questions should be put, because the question has to be considered from the Indian point of view.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CHAIRMAN: I am speaking in consequence of what Lord Wolseley said to you. We must bear in mind that questions must come within the scope of our reference. You say their subject comes within that scope, but I think you have gone rather close upon the limits of our reference occasionally.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes; but there are several statements made by Lord Wolseley which require to be controverted, and especially one which I would take—Lord Wolseley urged very strongly that England made India. Now that is a point upon which there is another side of the picture also, and I must therefore have that side put in; and, besides, he said that India is not a whole nation; that is not a necessity. India is like Europe, you may say, a large continent, and there were several native powers instead of one native power. That does not answer in any way the question I want to put; I want to say—perhaps the question has been misunderstood and muddled up a good deal—that our object here in the Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country for purposes in which both are interested. I want therefore to bring out those purposes in which both England and India are interested, and what England ought to contribute towards the apportionment as well as India. I am not saying that the whole benefit is British. I grant that whatever is done in the whole administration, India has its benefit; but England also has its benefit and therefore what portion should England pay for all that administration; and that is what I have to bring out, because that is the principal question for which the Commission is formed.

13,388. CHAIRMAN: Just bear in mind what the scope of our Commission is, and also bear in mind what Lord Wolseley's position is.—If I might say so, those all are questions of relative advantages, but upon those I cannot be expected to give evidence; I can only give you evidence upon facts.

13,389. Mr. CAINE: Lord Wolseley is an expert witness upon specific points?—On facts.

Mr. CAINE: He really ought only to be examined upon matters upon which he himself is an expert witness.

13,390. CHAIRMAN: Quite so.—And upon facts. I am not prepared to enter into problematical questions as to what would be the future.

Mr. NAOROJI: I am not putting problematical questions. I wish to give facts as they exist, and I want to ascertain them from Lord Wolseley, if he says he cannot answer those questions——

Mr. JACKSON: May we not have this question?

CHAIRMAN: Time gets on; please put your question.

13,391. Mr. NAOROJI: Lord Wolseley, you may have read an extract from Lord Kimberley's speech that I gave at the time of the examination of Sir Ralph Knox?—Yes; but may I say I read all those, and I cannot answer them. I read all the questions that you put to Sir Ralph Knox, and I am not prepared to answer any of them.

13,392. Very well, then. Of course, if you are not prepared and will not answer——?—It is not a question of "will not."

Mr. JACKSON: I do not think it ought to be put—here we are in the presence of reporters—that Lord Wolseley "will not" answer the question. I do not think that responsibility ought to be put upon Lord Wolseley.

13,393. Mr. NAOROJI: Having had a definite answer, I am not going to put those questions now. I only put a question which arises from Lord Wolseley's assumption as to what England has done for India. He bases all his argument upon the assertion that England has done so much for India that India must pay every farthing.

Mr. JACKSON: Will you not put the question?

Lord WOLSELEY: That is a historical question. I am not prepared to enter into that. These are all historical. I am quite prepared to answer you any questions that you will ask me bearing on the establishment of the army or the efficiency of the army, either in England or in India, or anything that comes within the scope of my own duties, but nothing else.

13,394. Mr. NAOROJI: Then it is very unfortunate that you made the remark several times that India was made by England what it was, and therefore India must pay every farthing for whatever England has to spend or whatever England imposes upon it, and you even demur to the word "imposing." Well, therefore, unfortunately these remarks being made I was bound to ask questions?—I am much obliged to you for your commentary on my evidence.

13,395. Mr. NAOROJI: Of course, if I am not to put this question or to go into this matter I, of course, yield to the decision of the Chairman. I only wanted to ask these questions because these remarks were made.

Mr. CAINE: We ought to discriminate a little in the questions. I do not attach any importance to what Lord Wolseley says on historical questions, but I attach the highest importance to what he says on military questions, and, when we come to report, I do not suppose that we shall be influenced in the drafting of our report by any opinion that Lord Wolseley gives either on political questions or on historical questions?—They will be of no value.

13,396. We only deal with what he says on military questions?—These are the only remarks of value in this enquiry.

CHAIRMAN: I think we ought to go farther than that. I do not think that questions simply involving policy ought to be put to a witness like Lord Wolseley, because it is rather hard upon a witness to have to reply, "I shall not," or "I cannot answer that question." I think the questions ought not to be put to him.

Mr. NAOROJI: I demur to the statement that I have said one single word to him upon a question of policy. I ask to put questions to Lord Wolseley, and he can make any answer to them he chooses.

Mr. JACKSON: We have not heard the question. Let us hear it put.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you will put your question; we quite understand what the position is.

13,397. Mr. NAOROJI: Very well; with regard to what England has done for India for her benefit or for her injury, I will just read a short statement?—Might I beg you to ask me a question? I shall be very glad to answer it. I do not want an essay read to me about what has taken place at some previous period of history. If you will ask me a question I will do my best to answer it, but to hear you read out some essay upon some problem would be of no use to me, and I am afraid I could give you no valuable reply to it.

13,398. If I ask my question I must explain what I mean. I will put the question at once. You state that England made India. I say that India has made England the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world, while the British administration, under the British authorities—not by the British people——

Mr. JACKSON: I think that should be given as evidence; that is not a question, is it?

Mr. NAOROJI: I want to ask this question; what England has done for India? I want to point out that England has done the greatest possible material injury to India. I ask the question, is it so, or not?

CHAIRMAN: Is not that a matter for you to give in evidence?

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, I will give evidence.

CHAIRMAN: That is, expressing your own views. We should be glad to hear them.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But would it not be better to hear that from you, if you went into the witness chair?

Mr. NAOROJI: Certainly, but when any witness makes a statement which ought to be controverted at once, I am obliged to intervene; otherwise, if I did not intervene, it may be taken to be my view. However, if my view is to be taken from my own evidence I am satisfied.

CHAIRMAN: If you will come in and give us evidence upon these points we shall be very glad, because it really is expressing your own view.

Mr. NAOROJI: I am asking whether Lord Wolseley's view is the same or not.

Mr. CAINE: Lord Wolseley on the subject you refer to only expresses a generally accepted opinion to which you demur and to which I demur too.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is a wrongly accepted opinion altogether, and therefore it should not go without being contradicted.

CHAIRMAN: Quite so. I know, Mr. Naoroji, your views upon this point, and I think it may be very desirable that you should have the opportunity of expressing them to us, but I think they would be expressed better in evidence than in questions to witnesses, which the witnesses cannot answer.

Mr. NAOROJI: I do not want to put any questions that the witness cannot answer, but I am quite willing to give it up.

CHAIRMAN: If you wish to give us evidence.

Mr. NAOROJI: That I have already offered. I think it is a fair way to put it.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

A BUDGET DEBATE IN BOMBAY.

NOTABLE SPEECH BY LORD SANDHURST.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NON-OFFICIAL MEMBERS.

WHY NOT MAKE THE DISCUSSION FRUITFUL?

On more than one occasion we have had the pleasure of acknowledging the new and better spirit which Lord Sandhurst has introduced into the Government of Bombay. His speech in the Bombay Legislative Council at the close of the recent discussion (August 17th and 18th) of the Bombay Provincial Budget has given so much satisfaction in India that we may well record it here in full. Some remarks upon it, from the pen of an esteemed correspondent in Bombay, will be found in "Indiana." The question that Lord Sandhurst's speech suggests is, why should not discussion upon the Budget be rendered fruitful? At present no division, and no amendment, is permitted. The criticisms of the non-official members, to the value of which Lord Sandhurst pays a striking tribute, are under the present system robbed of effect. Lord Sandhurst said:—

It now becomes my business to say a few words to wind up the proceedings of this Council on the annual discussion which takes place upon the Budget. Last year I inherited the Budget from my predecessor, Lord Harris, and could claim no responsibility for it at all. To-day, however, I share with my two honourable colleagues the responsibility for the statement and figures put before the meeting. It is very satisfactory to me that Government do not find themselves in such straits as they anticipated. There is one circumstance in connection with this day's proceedings to which I should like to draw attention, as it is of a personal nature. More or less, half-a-century ago on this very day a stranger was ushered into the world, and nobody could tell what a distinguished career lay in his future. That stranger was my honourable colleague on my left (Mr. Nugent), and I tender him my earnest congratulations and good wishes on his birthday to-day. (Hear, hear.) I should now like to say a word or two respecting this meeting. Mr. Birdwood made a remark or two thereon, and although I was not here just when Mr. Nugent commenced his speech, I suppose that he also said something on the subject.

"The one Opportunity in the Year."

I have now had something like twenty years' experience of the House of Lords, and may therefore express an opinion, and I venture to say it would be impossible to find any Legislative Chamber in which the Budget proceedings could have been conducted with more decorum than those of the Council over which I preside or where more carefully prepared speeches could be heard, speeches better both in style and tone than those we have heard to-day and yesterday. Some of the speeches were long, but of that I do not at all complain. This is the one opportunity in the year when hon. members can put forward their views in this Chamber in regard to the financial and general administration of Government. It is certainly to be expected that if these views are to be expressed at all a considerable time must be occupied in setting them forth. Not only have the speeches been good: they have also been impartial, to the purpose, and free from personalities. I will say this, that instead of the Budget discussion being looked upon by members of Government as a tedious burden, taking up a vast amount of the time of those engaged in administering the affairs of the Presidency, I shall look back upon these two days' proceedings with considerable pleasure, though unfortunately we have chosen for this discussion the first fine day we have had in Poona for the last five weeks, and have had to spend the whole of the day in this chamber. But business must come first and pleasure afterwards.

"Suggestions worthy of Consideration."

Mr. Tilak suggested, I think, although I could not make quite sure of his meaning, some course of arrangement by which our proceedings might become livelier, and he reiterated the statement two or three times. I have had considerable experience of public meetings of different sorts, and I am bound to say that though vigorous speeches and great liveliness are more amusing than a dull and matter-of-fact discussion of figures, which do not lend themselves to elaborate jokes, yet if these proceedings had become what I understand too lively, and if there were two parties of pronounced and opposite views, I should be inclined to vacate the chair and follow Mr. Pickwick's advice, if my principles allowed it, to shout with the largest crowd. (Laughter.) However, there was no occasion for anything of that kind. To-day and yesterday I had the assistance of the every member of Council in keeping order at our deliberations. It would be impossible to go into the details of all the criticisms that have been made; many answers have been given in speeches of considerable length by my colleagues, and especially by the financial member. I shall, of course, have an opportunity of reviewing the speeches made when we get them in their corrected form. Several suggestions have struck me as worthy of consideration, and when I read those speeches I shall make it a point to consider suggestions and, if need be, obtain information on the various points raised by hon. members. I wish to make one or two remarks in regard to the educational Budget. Since many of my recreative hours are passed in giving away prizes some people may think that education is one of my fads.

Education.

And I am indeed glad to say we are able to spend increasing funds on that important branch of the administration. It is encouraging to me to look at the figures which I have got out. I give the average expenditure. In the five years from April 1st, 1885, to April 1st, 1890, the actuals were fourteen lakhs and ninety thousand rupees, and in the next period of five years, sixteen and a-half lakhs. It is true that these are the actuals, and that possibly in the Budget larger grants were made. In the revised figures for the year 1895-6 the grant is put down at eighteen lakhs, while the figures for this year's Budget come to twenty lakhs. I should like to refer to one point touched on in the speech of Mr. Setalvad, who seemed to assume that, while we had too few trained masters for primary schools there were no trained masters at all for secondary and high schools. The training of masters for middle and high schools is a matter that has engaged the attention of Government. I understand the Hon. Mr. Setalvad to say they received no training as teachers. It is true they do not go to a training college, but in other ways they do receive a sound training. Some, as Dakshina Fellows, have spent a considerable time in teaching under the supervision of the staff of the colleges. The high school masters go through the four years course at a high school and then through the four years course at one of the colleges. During the whole of this eight years they have practical acquaintance with the methods of the best teachers we have. Afterwards they come as assistants under the influence of head masters, whose reputation depends more on the assistant masters they turn out than on their teaching in class. Masters of middle schools have as pupils both the middle school course and the high school course. We consider that no normal school for middle and high school teachers is needed. We agree with the Director of Public Instruction that in reality the University is a normal school for masters in the high school; and the high schools in their turn are normal schools for teachers in middle schools. Mr. Tilak made reference to what he termed channels of expenditure, and I understood him to say that these channels of expenditure should be changed. I think, possibly, he does not quite see that it would be practicable to adopt his suggestion, remembering that the greater part of the expenditure is made up for fixed charge. So that the money at the absolute discretion of Government is comparatively small. Hence no changes on a considerable scale could take place without great dislocation, if not total disorganisation, of the administration. There is one point I wish to refer to which was brought out in the speech of the Hon. Mr. Dharamsi, whom we congratulate upon taking part in this Budget discussion; and I am sure my honourable colleagues will join with me also in congratulating him upon the attractive way in which he put his views before us. He called the attention of Government to the disadvantages his co-religionists are under in regard to higher

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

education. I am bound to say that during my visit to Sind I was struck with the fact that in one school of 500 boys only 3 per cent. of the scholars were Muhammadans. I quite sympathise with what has fallen from Mr. Dharamsey, but I think he will agree with me that there are considerable difficulties in the way of favouring one sect more than another. I don't know that I can give him any more satisfactory answer than that, but I would point out that by what he has done his Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad has set an example of private benefaction. I also know that Mr. Kazi Shahabudin has set apart a considerable sum—Rs. 60,000 I believe—the interest of which is to provide scholarships for Muhammadan boys. Mr. Khare said that the tuition in small schools in the mofussil was conducted in such a way that the teaching was dull, the pupils listless, and so on. I am sorry to say that at present I have not had much opportunity of visiting and inspecting mofussil schools, and so cannot state my opinion on this subject. But I think that this subject, like several others of a kindred nature referred to here, can best be dealt with at the Educational Conference that we propose should take place.

Bombay Municipal Corporation.

The last point to which I wish to refer is in regard to the remarks of my honourable colleague, Mr. Mehta, upon the recent letter of the Government of Bombay as to the grant it is proposed to hand over to the Municipality for building purposes on certain terms. Mr. Mehta yesterday explained his interpretation of the law of the case, but Government, also, are not without their legal advisers. I do not in the least intend to follow all the arguments advanced by the two great controversialists who spoke one yesterday and the other this afternoon. I do not propose to follow either gentlemen into the past history of the case. What I am most anxious to do, and what my two colleagues are most anxious to do, is to look to the future, to see if we can bring about a different state of affairs. (Hear, hear.) I shall not proceed to criticise the methods or the conduct of the Municipal Corporation, either in the present or in the immediate past. If the conduct of the members of the Municipality has been unsatisfactory there are those who can call them to account. We all admired, I for one, the enthusiasm with which Mr. Mehta espoused the cause of the Corporation, where he undoubtedly wields a very great and leading influence, and I shall not readily forget the forensic skill with which he put forward his side of the case. But if I may diverge for one moment I would refer to the discussion in the public press and on the platform lately as to the relative merits and methods of the old and new diplomacy. I am not sure whether my honourable friend, Mr. Mehta, did not start yesterday the newest diplomacy. It seemed to me that while this question is the subject of negotiation, and the statement of the case for the Corporation is on its way to Government, it was somewhat surprising that he should deliver an ultimatum as to what the Corporation would or would not do under certain circumstances.

Mr. Mehta here rose and said: I am free to confess, your Excellency, that in the excitement of debate I was carried away too far, and said more than I had intended or was justified in saying. (Hear, hear.)

H.E. the President: The members of the Council will agree with me that that is a generous admission. (Cheers.) I will myself speak for the Corporation on this occasion, and will say that the admission will not cause Mr. Mehta to lose weight in the Corporation, but will increase the admiration of its members for Mr. Mehta's public spirit and fairness. (Hear, hear.) I was glad to hear the admission, because once you have burnt your ships you must go forward: you have no retreat, and cannot retrieve a blunder. It is difficult for a man who has made a determined statement as to what he will or will not do to retract; while on the other hand it is difficult for the opposite party to make further concessions, when a definite declaration has been made. Therefore, I welcome most cordially the admission of my honourable colleague that he had said something in heat of debate which he is at liberty to withdraw or modify. I do not think myself it is advisable for us more than we can help to dwell on the history of the past in regard to the Bombay schools. The thing is to look at the future and make the best arrangements that we can.

"Patience—the most useful quality for a Governor."

When I came out here I was given much good advice, some by wise men and some by others of whose judgment I have not so high an opinion, as to what I should observe and the lines of policy I should pursue. But the experience of nearly a year and a-half that I have had has led me to this conclusion, that perhaps the most useful quality for a Governor is the quality of patience. In regard to this particular matter, I shall exercise that quality, and I am sure both my colleagues will exercise it also. We will do our best to bring the matter to a happy and satisfactory conclusion. I feel very often that I am in need not so much of the support as the restraint of my two honourable colleagues. What with my residence in Bombay, my acquaintance with the schools there, and also the hurried visit to the poorer parts of Bombay and to the slums (of which, I think, I have more knowledge than a great many residents of Bombay), I am in fear of being too much of a Bombay man. But I cannot help reflecting that while Bombay lies nearer to my affections there are other parts of the Presidency to be considered. I have now visited the greater part of the Presidency, and I have had an opportunity of seeing and conversing with leaders of public opinion in the Presidency proper and in Sind. I must be very careful, in spite of the affection I have for the capital, to be fair all round. Some mention was made by Mr. Mehta of the grant towards the building of Bhooleshwur School, and Mr. Kirkham gave a hint that the grant has not yet been paid. But I need not point out that though the bargain was made by a previous Government it will be carried out by mine. In regard to the matter of higher education, I have said on many platforms that while I am anxious to foster primary education I am in no way blind to the requirements of higher education. Whatever opponents may think as to our policy with regard to the University (and the intentions of administrators are often liable to misinterpretations and misrepresentations) what we want is to do the best we can for all classes in this Presidency. I shall endeavour with the help of my colleagues, and such suggestions as I from time to time receive, to do the best I can for the whole of the Presidency, whose interests I have the honour temporarily to hold in trust.

PRINCE RANJITSINHJI.

We take the following extracts from an "interview" with Prince Ranjitsinhji which appears in the September No. of the *Strand Magazine*:—

"I was born in India on September 10, 1872, at Sarodar, in the province of Kathiawar. I was always very fond of athletics, and, I should say, commenced playing cricket when I was about ten or eleven years of age."

"And when you came to England?"

"I was about sixteen when I first arrived in this country. No, I did not proceed to Cambridge at once. I remained in London for about six months under the care of a private tutor, preparing for my exams. During that time I played a great deal of lawn tennis, a game I am very fond of, and a little cricket with a private club. When I went to Cambridge, however, I was very keen upon the game, and practised assiduously. Naturally, I found a great difference in the Indian and English styles, and I had, if I may say so, to 'unlearn' the former before I could do much with the latter. I found English cricket very different from what I had been accustomed to, although I had the advantage of being coached by some of the Surrey professionals, such as Sharpe, Richardson, Lockwood, Watts, and others. They come down to Cambridge every year, I may explain, to coach the undergraduates. Did I not find the new game hard to learn? Yes, I did; for it was almost two years before I was capable of doing much with it. I should say that I was not able to play it properly until 1891. Of course, I did not go

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

into the University eleven until 1893. That was, in fact, my first and last year, as I came down at the end of the season."

"County cricket? Oh, I think that is very good indeed, as a rule; although there is a proviso to be added. That is, that I consider it is beginning to be looked upon in a too serious manner, and is being made too much of a business character."

"The counties? On their season's all-round form, I think that Surrey is the best team. Here, also, I might add, upon a good wicket. Yorkshire, on the other hand, are the best team upon a bad wicket. Another thing is, that I consider that if Richardson were taken out of the Surrey team they would drop back considerably. Richardson is a grand bowler, and in his absence the county eleven would suffer an almost irretrievable loss. Of course, the same may be said of others beyond Surrey. For instance, if you were to take Mold out of the Lancashire team, the result would be the same. No, I do not think Yorkshire would be affected in the same manner if any one particular bowler were withdrawn. They have a first-class reserve to fall back upon, and are in fact a fine all-round batting, bowling, and fielding side."

Australian cricket was then touched upon by the Prince.

"The Antipodean eleven playing in England are a very good side," he remarked. "They are very good all round, but their batting, as a whole, is superior to their bowling."

"Still, they have been very successful in their engagements, haven't they?"

"Yes. I should say they are a better team than any other I have seen with one exception, in the bowling of the 1886 eleven. At that time C. T. B. Turner and Ferris were at their best."

"Let me see, I think G. H. S. Trott coached you a little when you first came to England?" I remarked.

"No," was the smiling reply, "there's not an atom of truth in that report. Yes, I see it has been stated as a fact in certain quarters, but you may deny it *in toto*. What really happened was this: When I came across from India I visited the Oval in company with my tutor. The match then being played was Surrey *v.* the Australians. We were invited into the pavilion, and Mr. Alcock very kindly introduced several members of the Colonial eleven to me. Percy M'Donnell, C. T. B. Turner, and G. H. S. Trott were amongst the number. They chatted to me upon cricket matters for a few moments, but I received no hints whatever. How the idea first gained ground I am unable to say; but it is utter nonsense to imagine for a moment that I was then assisted in any way by Trott."

"What style of batting should I recommend? I should advise any young player to follow up the style, under capable coaching, that comes to him naturally. I cannot say that I am an advocate for stone-walling, but every player finds it necessary to exhibit a certain degree of caution at times. There is no reason why a batsman, however, should try to score at the expense of getting out, and simply to earn the applause of a certain section of the public. The showy player may be cheered by those who simply visit a match for the express purpose of witnessing rapid scoring, and who do not care or know anything about the more delicate side of the game. I certainly do not believe in 'playing for the gallery,' neither do I believe in making the game unnecessarily slow. A player should endeavour to strike the happy medium. The method of the county championship? I think it was a right and generous recognition of merit when the new counties were included in the running, and it has made the struggle keener. Oh, yes, I have heard that several advocate some of the older counties being dropped but I do not favour such a suggestion."

A recollection of seeing the Prince in football costume while at Cambridge next provoked a question from me upon the subject.

"Yes," he replied, "I played football at Cambridge until I hurt my knee, then I thought it time to give it up. Association at first, and Rugby afterwards, as I cared for it much more than the dribbling game; my knee gave way, however, at Association."

"Which do I consider the best game? Rugby, certainly. It is possible to get up your interest in even a bad game under that code; but under the other, the play must be very good indeed to repay watching it. Another thing is, I consider Rugby far safer from a player's point of view. You may get a scratch or a bruise, but in Association, if you are kicked or thrown, the injury is of a far more lasting character."

"Do I go in for athletics? Not much now, but I am very fond of shooting. Cycling? Yes, I cycle a little, and I have two American bicycles in the pavilion now. I am very fond of tennis and racquets. In fact, at one time, I played the former very much better than I did cricket. Yes (in reply to an incredulous smile on my part), I assure you it is a fact."

"And I believe you bowl a little?" I remarked as I rose to leave the Prince.

"Yes, I can bowl a little. In fact, I was very successful when I first commenced playing for Sussex. Now, however, Mr. Murdoch does not care to put me on, as he is afraid I should spoil my batting. Mr. Stoddart, of Middlesex, is not put on to bowl, I believe from the same cause, so we sympathise with each other for the harsh treatment of our respective captains. My style? I should describe as being a slow medium, with a break from the off."

Then, as a final question, I asked the Prince if he could tell me how he had been so successful at such an early period of his career.

"Luck," was his laughing response. "I commence my practice very early. I am shooting through the winter, and so keep myself fit, and in April I am at the nets. But luck is everything with a cricketer. If he has that—and a little skill—he has little to fear."

Commenting on Lord G. Hamilton's remarks, in his recent Budget speech, upon the native press of India, the *Times of India* (September 4th) writes: "these remarks might with advantage have been less brief, inasmuch as they seem to make an unjustifiably sweeping charge against the native press as a whole. . . . . We are glad to feel that there are many, very many, honourable exceptions to this indictment, and that the majority of the native journals of this country are conducted with conspicuous fairness and impartiality."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"THE SYSTEMATIC PLUNDER OF INDIA."

[From "The Investors' Review."]

In all probability the true reason for the persistence of the Government in charging the ordinary pay and the ordinary cost of transport for these troops (the Indian troops at Suakin) on the Indian revenue, is that the War Office here ordered it to do so. The actual amount involved is small, not so small as the Government made out, for the £35,000 mentioned will only pay the troops for seven months, and we think it not improbable that much larger numbers of men than are there at present will be required to assist in the Soudan war for indefinite months to come. So, if we put the charge at £100,000 per annum, all told, it will be well within the mark in all probability. But at the largest estimate it is a paltry affair and mean to a degree. The policy of the English War Office, however, has consistently been, ever since we took over India from the Company in 1858, to load upon the backs of the Indian people as many excessive charges as possible. The ordinary expenditure of India in England, in payment of English soldiers trained and sent to India and for war materials furnished through the British War Office, is a permanent scandal of the grossest description, and, by all the laws governing the rise and fall of empires, must contribute one day in an important degree to the destruction of our Indian dominion. For the War Office, then, to have consented to the payment by the English Treasury of Indian troops employed in the Egyptian war, would have been the surrender by it of a part of the power to systematically rob that dependency. So the Government had no alternative any more than other Governments, Liberal or Tory, which have gone before it. Parliamentary figure-heads exist principally to obey, or to screen, the permanent bureaucracy and the miserable spectacle presented by Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons on 6th July last was all in the way of earning his salary.

The episode fills the mind with disgust. It cannot really be maintained that honest conviction was strongly manifested on either side of the House, except by Mr. John Morley. His speech had a genuine ring of intense earnestness throughout; yet even he, were he Secretary of State for India to-morrow, would most likely have had to do very much what Lord George Hamilton has done—yield or go. We wish it could be believed that the consequences of this display of base selfishness in a small thing, on the part of the English officials and their parliamentary mouthpieces, might be such as to prevent a recurrence of impositions upon India of a similar kind, but that is too much to expect. The rumpus caused by this small matter measured by £ s. d., and the ill-feeling it has produced in India, will pass away and be forgotten. Its main use may be said to be to divert the attention of both peoples from the systematic plunder of India which goes on all the year round unheeded. It is often so in politics; great crimes against a nation may be committed with impunity, when a small incident, in itself of no vital importance, will cause a *furore* of excitement. In the present case there is a danger involved, of course, which magnifies the incident—a danger that might, as Lord Salisbury in former times was shrewd enough to see, involve most serious consequences to the people of England. Should we fall into the habit of employing mercenary troops from India in the various African wars, which we seem destined to wage for another generation—assuming that India keeps financially on her legs for so long—a day might come when an unscrupulous Government would not hesitate to employ them against ourselves. But this point was comparatively little insisted upon in the recent debate, except by Mr. Morley—most of the energy of speakers, as well as press, was spent in denouncing the meanness of the one particular act. It was mean; but the danger behind it lay not so much in its meanness, as in the readiness, which will grow with use, to draw upon India for the men and money to conduct military expeditions in other parts of the Empire. And, after all, this is in accordance with the arrogant spirit of the modern Imperialist, whose endeavour it is to run the Empire in order to make money by it.

THE CRIMINAL LAW OF INDIA.

Under this heading Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, M.P., contributed to the *Pall Mall Gazette* of September 26th an interesting review of Mr. J. D. Mayne's edition (recently noticed in our columns) of the Indian Penal Code. We take the following extracts from Mr. Pickersgill's article:—

The Indian Penal Code is beyond question one of the most interesting "documents" of criminal jurisprudence. In form, a unique interest attaches to it as the first, and so far the only, example in legislation of the method of stating the law in general propositions accompanied by specific illustrations, thus combining the good points of statute-law and case-law. This method, invented by Macaulay, and described by Sir Frederick Pollock as "an instrument of new constructive power," has been triumphantly justified by thirty-six years' practical experience of its working in India. Passing from the form to the substance of the Code, we enter on a wide field of controversy. It is obvious that the criminal law which is embodied in the Indian Penal Code is not a local growth, but is based on notions evolved in totally different circumstances by a different race of people. Moreover, while it is clear that the Code does not represent Indian ideas, it is equally true that in certain respects it does not represent *our* ideas of practical legislation. We have in fact laid upon India a yoke which we ourselves would be unable to bear. Apart altogether from the enactments which are justified by local circumstances, there are many provisions in the Indian Penal Code which, in 1860 at all events, we should never have dreamed of enacting for ourselves, and there are some which we should not dream of enacting now. By way of example, take the law as to "cheating," contained in section 415 of the Code, by which it is enacted that, "whoever, by deceiving any person, fraudulently or dishonestly induces the person so deceived

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to deliver any property," and so on, commits a crime. Here it will be observed that the words are of the widest possible character; they cover the case of a promise as to future conduct not intended to be kept, and under them any person who failed to fulfil a civil contract would be liable to be harassed by a criminal prosecution. The provision goes far beyond the law, not only of England, but also of France. And thus arises the anomaly that we are enforcing by a criminal sanction upon an Eastern people a standard of commercial morality which would be regarded as intolerable in London or Paris. As another illustration I may cite the law as to negligence in the use of machinery. Section 287 of the Penal Code makes it a crime punishable with six months' imprisonment for any person "knowingly or negligently to omit to take such order with any machinery in his possession or under his care as is sufficient to guard against any probable danger to human life from such machinery." This provision again goes very far beyond anything in our English Factory Acts. Yet another example is furnished by the criminal law of defamation, respecting which it may suffice to quote the comment of Mr. Whitley Stokes, that the provisions "would if strictly applied to English and (probably) native scandalmongers lead to alarming consequences." In two other cases England long lagged behind India. The procuring of girls for immoral purposes had been a crime in India for a quarter of a century before a similar protection was extended to girls in England. Lastly, the Indian Penal Code passed in 1860 protected children of tender years against cruelty and acts endangering life or health on the part of their parents or guardians; whereas we in England had to wait until 1889 for our first Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

The Code of Criminal Procedure is open to much the same kind of criticism as the Penal Code itself; that is, it represents English, not Indian ideas, and as representing English ideas the whole system is based on "public sympathy with equity and the desire to have justice done"; whereas, according to the official statement, "public opinion in India is an apathetic, if not an adverse, influence in the investigation of local crime." Even the elaborate scheme of appeals, which plays so large a part in the administration of the criminal law in India, has its seamy side. For we are told that "it is a too common fault of the native magistrates who preside over the lower courts to pass a decision with the fear of reversal before their eyes, and to acquit accordingly in all but the very simplest or plainest cases." As in 1892 there were 32,429 sentences reversed or reduced on appeal, this result is not perhaps surprising. But the effect of all this on the native mind is disastrous. The official report states that "among the people at large who have had experience of the working of the criminal law the impression prevails that the provisions unduly favour the chance of escape of a person who is really guilty." It would be peculiarly unfortunate in India, where the great difficulty in administering the criminal law has always been to secure the co-operation of the people in putting down high-handed crime, if the opinion were to spread that a just charge will probably result in an acquittal.

Review.

ANCIENT INDIA.

Ancient India. Its Invasion by Alexander the Great. By J. W. M'Crindle, M.A., M.R.A.S., F.R.S.G.S. New edition. (London: Constable and Co.)

Of the series of works on Ancient India, translated by Mr. M'Crindle from ancient authors, this is undoubtedly the one most likely to attract the attention of the general reader. The students of ancient geography are necessarily few. The subject is one which only commends itself to the specialist. But there must be many readers outside the ranks of the specialists to whom ancient history, and more especially the history of so imposing a personality as Alexander's, commends itself, and who would gladly seize the opportunity of going to the fountain-head for their information if such an opportunity were afforded them. Of late years the English nation has come to feel with ever-increasing intensity that the keystone and centre of the Empire is India, and the interest aroused by this feeling has extended to the early period of Indian history. The long series of works published by the Clarendon Press and Messrs. Constable and Co. in particular, bear evidence to the reality of the demand for information. The fact that Mr. M'Crindle's work has reached a second edition is in itself a striking proof of the attention which is being paid to Indian annals. For this is in no real sense a history of Alexander's invasion of India. Rather it is a collection of the materials available for such a history, with some notes, and suggestions, and the discussion of a few disputed points in topography. Moreover there is much suggestiveness in the long preface to the second edition where it is shown that, apart from the mere commercial demand for a second edition, some revision or defence of the author's opinions was necessitated by the publication of a work by Franz Schwarz, of Munich, directly bearing on the campaigns of Alexander in the East, of Major General Haig's volume on the Indus Delta, and of a lecture by Colonel Holdich on Alexander's retreat from India.

"Imperfect Disinfection is no Disinfection at all."

The Only Reliable Disinfecting Powder
is
"CALVERT'S,"

Guaranteed to contain 15 per cent. Calvert's No. 5 Carbolic, the strongest disinfectant known.
In 6d., 1/-, and 1/6 Tins; also 7lb and 14lb. Cases, at 2/6 and 4/- each (English Rates).
Cheaper in use than Powders at lower rates, much less being needed.
Will not clog pipes or drains.

☞ Avoid Worthless Imitations made with Tar Oils.

Dr. R. M. Gover, in Report to Director-General of Convict Prisons, says "The preparations of Carbolic Acid supplied by Messrs. Calvert and Co. are, in my opinion, *much superior to those of any other manufacturer.*"

F. C. CALVERT and CO., MANCHESTER.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

There are many reasons to account for the somewhat scanty treatment hitherto meted out to Alexander's Indian campaign. In the first place, it has always been in connection with the history of Greece, or of Hellenic civilisation, that Alexander's conquests have been discussed, and it is only of late years that the awakening of an interest other than the mere scholarly and antiquarian interest in Eastern affairs has assigned to this portion of the great conqueror's achievements its proper importance. Also, the comparative permanence, slight though it was, of Alexander's arrangements in Asia Minor led to the gradual overthrow of Persian influence, and by opening up the way for Hellenic civilisation rendered possible also the extension of Christianity to those regions. But the wave of conquest that passed over the Hindu Kush receded again leaving little or no trace of its passage, and India remained isolated from the Western world, developing its religion, arts, and civilisation on its own lines. Now, however, that the point of view is transferred from Pella or Athens to Attock and Peshawar, the records of the Macedonian inroad acquire a fresh value as a picture of Indian civilisation nineteen centuries ago. Brief though the glimpse is, its worth is considerably enhanced by reflection on the centuries that elapse before the Western world is again permitted to look upon the Eastern. To the modern student of the North-West frontier question, Alexander's military movements are of special significance as illustrating the difficulty of the only really practicable military route into India, namely, the route by the Khaiber Pass. That a picked force of veteran troops under the leadership of, perhaps, the greatest general that ever lived, without the encumbrances of a modern army, should have successfully accomplished the difficult passage, and then have defeated Porus and his large forces on the Djhilam, is less an argument against the wisdom of Porus's position than a proof of Alexander's surpassing ability. Porus had the satisfaction of knowing that he had offered Alexander the most serious resistance he had hitherto encountered in the East. To argue that the proper place to check an advancing enemy is the Hindu Kush would be equivalent to maintaining that, because Hannibal and Napoleon both invaded Italy from the north, therefore the true frontier of Italy is the western foot of the Alps.

Mr. M'Crindle, although he has prefixed to his work, by way of introduction, a life of Alexander, which if a little unnecessary is as at any rate convenient, has entered into no discussion of his character, though his omission or qualified admission of some of the less creditable anecdotes told in connection with Alexander seem to indicate his preference for the moderate views of Freeman and Thirlwall. He has limited his task to the translation of such portions of the works of Arrian, Quintus Curtius, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and Justin, as bear on the short period legitimately embraced by the title of his volume. Occasionally he departs from his scheme of providing materials for history, as in his appreciation of the comparative values of the authors whom he presents in English dress, and in some few of his appendices, which are not unfrequently prolix or beside the mark. We might refer for instances to the notes on peacocks, on serpents, or on the bore of the Hughli. The translations are literal but readable, and the indexes fairly complete. There are still some clerical errors which the revision proper to a second issue should have removed, as, for instance, the spelling of Sousa on the map. The maps themselves are convenient guides to the route of Alexander's forces but are not sufficiently complete to enable the reader to follow the details of the campaigns without the aid of Kiepert. Comparatively few additions would make them adequate for this purpose also and greatly increase the reader's comfort. Printing, paper, and binding reflect great credit on Messrs. Constable and Co.

The multiplicity of subjects dealt with in "Pros and Cons: A Guide to the Controversies of the Day" (Swan Sonnenschein and Co.), prohibits anything more than a brief statement, in each case, of some of the arguments "for" and "against." Questions political, social, and theological are discussed with brevity and impartiality, and a large number of general readers will probably find the compilation useful. It is perhaps a pity that no more than four pages out of some three hundred are given to Indian questions. "Child Marriages," "Indian Home Rule," and "Indian Defence" are summarily disposed of. But there is more in the Indian problem than that.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

Geographical Journal. Curzon, Hon. G. N., "Pamirs."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 2, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). R. H., "Travancore." Olcott, Col. H. S., "A Rajput Wedding." "The Indian Institute at Oxford."

National Review. Poynder, Sir J. Dickson, "A Bird's-Eye View of the North-West Frontier."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

Sanjana, Darab Dastur Peshotan, B.A.	"The Kârnâmê Artakhohîr I Pâpakân, being the oldest Surviving Records of the Zoroastrian Emperor, Ardashu Bâbakân." (Bombay: Education Society's Steam Press, Byculla)	— —
Thurston, Edgar	"A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India." (Calcutta: Printed by the Superintendent of Government Printing)	— —
M'Crindle, J. W., M.A.	"The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great, as described by Arrian, Q. Curtius, Diodorus, and Plutarch." (Constable)	10s. 6d.
Ballantine, Henry	"On India's Frontier; or Nepal, the Gurkha's Mysterious Land." With plates. (Redway)	7s. 6d.
Mansford, Charles J.	"Under the Naga Banner." Illustrated. (John Hogg)	3s 6d.

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

Civil Service Commission:—	
India Forest Service and Indian Police Force. June, 1896	1s. 0d.
House of Commons Paper:—	
[313.] East India (Madras Presidency) (Evictions) —Return relating to	0s 0½d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 11. (NEW SERIES.)] NOVEMBER, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, Six Shillings per ann. In India, Six Rupees.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	321
Judicial and Executive Duties in India: Sir C. Elliott's "Apologia."	
I.—By Herbert J. Reynolds, C.S.I.	326
II.—By Sir John B. Phear	330
III.—By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	333
Our London Letter	336
Lord Welby's Commission	337
The Liberal Leadership	338
Walter Pater's Last Work	339
Sir C. Elliott on the Defensive, by J. Dacosta	341
The Growth of Indian Expenditure	344
The Proposed Parliamentary Committee on Indian Finance	345
The Civil Service of India	346
The Cotton Industry in India	347
Reviews: Lectures of Adam Smith	349
"His Honor and a Lady"	350
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	352
Recent Official Publications	352

Indiana.

Help from Sir C. Elliott.

THE attention of our readers is specially directed to the articles which appear in our present issue upon the combination of executive with judicial duties in India. Mr. Herbert J. Reynolds, C.S.I., Sir John Budd Phear, Professor A. F. Murison, and Mr. J. Dacosta have favoured us with a series of unanswerable criticisms upon the remarkable apology for the existing system which Sir Charles Elliott contributes to the current number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. It only remains for us to tender to Sir Charles our sincere thanks for a piece of candour which is, and will be, of such enormous assistance to us. After the frank admissions of the *Englishman* it was, of course, impossible for any apologist of the combination of incompatible functions to dwell seriously upon the cost of reform. That bubble, as Sir Charles Elliott by implication admits, has been burst for ever. He addresses himself, therefore, to the courageous task of defending "the detective as judge" as a meritorious institution, and of belittling the numerous and scandalous cases of injustice for which the anomaly is responsible. This, of course, is precisely what was wanted from our opponents. "His ideas," as a distinguished Anglo-Indian jurist writes, "are about as extravagant as they can be. All the better for us. The more extravagant his ideas, the more the injustice of the system ought to present itself to right-thinking people." Sir Charles Elliott has rendered the Congress the only service that lay in his power in the cynicism of his tone, the frankness of his admissions, and the audacity of his defence of the indefensible. He is to be congratulated upon having (however involuntarily) strengthened the hands of the deputation which is shortly to wait upon the Secretary of State for India and lay the whole case for reform before him. Lord George Hamilton, in his speech on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons, suggested that the only difficulty in the way was the pecuniary difficulty. Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt has satisfactorily disposed of that contention, and now Sir Charles Elliott and the *Englishman* have made it abundantly clear that the real objections of our opponents are quite different and quite untenable. They have only to be clearly stated in order to strengthen our hands.

India and Foreign Policy.

LORD ROSEBERY'S remarkable speech at Edinburgh (October 9th) has been summarised, not unfairly, by Mr. Leonard Courtney, M.P., as contending that

"we are distrusted, if not detested, by every European Power. And we are so weak with swollen Empire that we are under hostages for at least twenty years to come. The weary Titan

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

has become a fat Falstaff, obese and floundering, gorged beyond digestion, incapable of action."

The key of the situation, according to Mr. Courtney, is Egypt. But is it not nearer the truth to say (as we hinted last month) that the error which underlies the whole of British foreign policy is a wrong estimate of the conditions affecting British rule in India? Since the settlement of the Canadian difficulty in 1867, the colonies have caused the mother country scarcely an hour's anxiety. The fear of Canadian annexation to the United States is now known to be a nightmare. In spite of disturbances in the Transvaal, little doubt is entertained as to the safety of the South African colonies. Australia and New Zealand are evidently at the mercy of any fleet which can even temporarily gain command of the ocean, but it is equally evident that no Power in the world could for a moment hope to occupy or hold them against the will of their inhabitants. It is fast becoming a mere truism that the colonies are bound closely to the mother country by bonds of mutual interest and respect, rendered the stronger by the laxity of the formal and legal ties that unite the central government to the self-governing dependencies. Nor would Venezuela ever be allowed to produce more than a diplomatic struggle between nations so closely akin as England and the United States. No international question of first-rate importance has been discussed or fought out by force of arms during the present reign in which the attitude of England has not been chiefly determined by the imaginary necessity of preserving the Indian frontiers from the danger of Russian aggression, or of securing the route to India by the Suez Canal. The fortification of Gibraltar and Malta, the annexation of Cyprus, the prolonged occupation of Egypt, and the repeated attempts to bolster up Turkish rule in Asia were inspired by this same desire, which half a century or more of custom, reinforced by the "Jingoism" of Tory ministries, has raised to the dignity of a cardinal principle of British diplomacy. With the speech of Mr. Gladstone still ringing in their ears, students of contemporary politics need hardly be reminded that while England relied on the aid of other Powers to secure the revision of the Treaty of San Stefano in such a direction as to exclude Russia from the Mediterranean, the secret Cyprus Convention guaranteed the inviolability of the Sultan's Asiatic dominions, in order to guard against a possible Russian advance through Asia Minor and Persia, and so to the Persian Gulf and India. An Englishman needs no proof to assure him of the fact that India is the most glorious heritage he has received from his ancestors. The sense of power which is gratified by the control exercised over the destinies of three hundred millions of people, in no way inferior and often superior in intellect and civilisation to the races of the western world, causes him to assert the inseparableness of the union between England and India with a vigour which even a knowledge of the mercenary advantages derived from Indian trade, or the sentimental attachment to a country where so much English blood has been spent, and where France and England fought out their duel for the colonial empire of the world, could hardly inspire alone. But Englishmen do not for the most part make the very easy and obvious inference that the corner-stone of the Empire must be the keystone of imperial policy.

The Russian Spectre.

It is nearly seventy years since that loyal co-operation of France, Russia, and England, which is to-day the earnest desire of every humane Englishman, was last witnessed in the establishment of Greek independence. The friendship then felt by England for Russia has since been replaced by a morbid dread of her increasing power; and the energy of a series of British ministries has been directed to the purpose, foredoomed to futility, of checking the natural expansion of a youthful nation. With lamentable want of foresight it was believed that Russia could and, if left to grow undisturbed, ultimately would threaten British supremacy in India. There was the only point at which the interests of the two countries met in conflict. In accordance with this belief the Indian Government adopted the fatal policy of interference with the Afghans, a race whose brave and ardent attachment to liberty was a sufficient guarantee that they would resist any attempt at conquest by Russia as vigorously and as successfully as they have hitherto resisted all attempts at subjugation by Anglo-Indian troops. Ten years later, England, with French aid, embarked on an iniquitous war in the Crimea in order to cripple Russia. The net result of the war was the loss to the four nations engaged of over half a million of men, and to England alone of seventy-seven millions of money. Five years later, England was engaged in feverish preparations against her former ally. Fifteen years later, Russia had taken advantage of the temporary weakness of France to insist on a revision of the ridiculous stipulations of the Treaty of Paris, and had acquired the right to maintain a fleet in the Black Sea. How far France was from feeling that the interests of her people were injuriously affected by this action of Russia's is seen in the growing friendship between the two nations during the next twenty years, and the steady increase of French hostility to English policy. To this result the pseudo-imperial character of Disraeli's policy from

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

1874 to 1880 immensely contributed. His genius combined with Russophobist activity in Asia an attempt to gain for England an ascendancy in the councils of Europe without entangling her in any Continental alliances. The result of this union of misguided and impossible schemes was seen in a war as disastrous as the preceding one in Afghanistan, resembling it in every detail, equally destitute of result, and ending in the acceptance of the Russian *protégé* Abdur Ráhman as ruler in Kabul. In Europe it produced the purchase of the Suez canal shares, which, while laudable as a commercial investment, cannot justly be vaunted as a superb stroke of policy, or as constituting a British right to a protectorate of Egypt with the view of securing the route to India. It resulted also in the thwarting of European intervention in Turkey by the Berlin Note of 1876, in threats towards Russia which, in view of her action in checking the revolt of Servia and Montenegro in 1876, and her declaration before she commenced the war in 1878, were an insult to that Power; and it produced a display of military force by the unconstitutional summoning of Indian troops to Cyprus. Small wonder, therefore, that Russia, irritated by the overbearing attitude of the British Government, should revenge herself by once more arousing British fears with regard to India, and provoke another costly and useless invasion of Afghanistan. French jealousy and apprehension had already been roused by the hasty purchase of the Khedive's shares, and such apprehension was not likely to be lulled by the growing influence of Englishmen in the administration of Egypt. The evidence of French suspicion was the demand for representation on the Egyptian ministerial council, and the appointment of M. de Blignières. Its justification is the course of events from the bombardment of Alexandria down to the present time. Far from making any preparations for the evacuation or neutralisation of Egypt, England has avowed her intention of reconquering the Sudan as far as Khartum before she withdraws from the control of Egyptian affairs. It is besides notorious that no official of high rank is Egyptian, and consequently that no provision is being made for the management of the various State departments in the event of evacuation. The consequences of the disregard of French prejudice, and her lawful claims, have been seen in the persistent hostility of the French press, the strengthening of the alliance between France and Russia, Russian activity in Central Asia when England's action being unusually vigorous has called forth unusual resentment on the part of France—witness the Penjdeh incident in 1885, and the threat of a Russian railway to Herat during the present summer—and the suspicion and hostility which was provoked by the proposal of England to intervene in Armenia. How can British action in Egypt be reconciled with the despatch of Lord Granville to Lord Dufferin, wherein he said, "Her Majesty's Government continues to hold the view that any intervention in Egypt should represent the united action and authority of Europe?"

India the Keystone.

THUS the present policy of England, after a trial lasting more than half-a-century, has not only failed in its immediate objects of checking the extension of Russian influence in the East, and in Central Asia, but it has led successive Governments into disastrous and costly wars, and even to breaches of faith which, by exciting the profound distrust that characterises all foreign views of English diplomacy, have reduced the country to impotence on the one occasion when the national conscience dictates vigorous action on purely disinterested lines. The long-desired conjunction of France and Russia with England should of course be secured without any avoidable delay. Such an alliance would be welcomed by the whole world, except, perhaps, Germany, whose vituperation of England is based on colonial and commercial jealousies, and may therefore be disregarded in this connection. But more than this is necessary. No merely temporary alliance will suffice. The basis of English policy needs to be revised, and, in order to this, a true conception of the position of India must be reached. The Russian spectre on the North-West Frontier must be exorcised once and for all. Not only is there no evidence of the existence of any Russian designs with India as their object, but even during half a century of British aggression, accompanied by numerous expeditions on the North-West, Russia has made no demonstration except on the two or three occasions when the European interests of herself or her ally rendered a diversion advisable. She has contented herself with gradually absorbing the peoples of Central Asia, promoting trade and the arts of peace, and so naturally extending her frontiers to the Hindu Kush, the limits assigned by geographical conditions. Not even when the Mutiny threatened to destroy British rule did she raise a hand to interfere, though she was still smarting under the restraints imposed upon her by the Treaty of Paris, and the frontier was denuded of British troops. Travellers and even British officers like Colonel Gerard of the Pamir Delimitation Commission bear testimony to her peaceful pursuits in those regions. Such a change of attitude on our part would be necessarily followed by the cessation of all advance on the North-West, and a wide and frank recognition of the fact, so often pointed out by competent judges, and emphasised by the bitter experience of Kandahar, Maiwand, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Kabul, that a free Afghanistan is the best guarantee against aggression. At the same time the consequent improvement in Indian finance by the rapid reduction of her inflated military expenditure would check the growing discontent and render vain the attempt of any foreign power to overthrow British rule by means of sedition in India. With a peaceful, contented, and prosperous India even the apparent expediency of a prolonged occupation of Egypt, with all its manifold disadvantages, would vanish. The neutralisation of Egypt under a European guarantee, the evacuation of Chitral, and withdrawal from Cyprus on such conditions as shall best promote the welfare of the inhabitants—these measures can alone enable England, having redeemed her long-neglected pledges, to take that place in the councils of Europe which should be hers, not in virtue of definite alliances with any group of Powers, but as an honourable and powerful nation, the defender of the weak and the vindicator of freedom. In India Great Britain has violated her high tradition of constitutional government for the benefit of the people. Her offence has brought with it its own punishment in a certain loss of political uprightness, and a certain nervousness that is characteristic of a guilty conscience. The oft-exploded fallacy still obtains that India is held by English troops, and not in virtue of popular assent to British rule as good in the main though capable of improvement. On that falsehood, and on the kindred fallacy that India is likely to become the willing prey of a foreign power, rests the whole fabric of aggression, political nervousness and crooked diplomacy which has gained for England the dislike and distrust of her neighbours. The loyalty of India was put to the severest possible test in 1857 and it proved equal to it. Since then it has triumphantly stood the strain of innumerable petty shocks and minor injustices. What reason, therefore, prevents the granting to India of some measure of self-government or representation such as proved so successful in securing the adherence of the colonies to Great Britain? Such institutions are, historically, at least as natural to the Indian people as to the English. Then India, "the brightest jewel of the British crown," would become a treasure to be displayed with pride, not clutched and brooded over with miserly apprehensions that see an enemy in every shadow. She would become the bulwark of England's strength, instead of being as she is now, through no fault of her own, a source of frequent weakness.

The "Forward" Policy.

In a letter published in the *Geographical Journal* for October, Colonel Holdich writes from Simla that since laying down the Afghan boundary between Chitral and Kafiristan, which, as he remarks, was done *pari passu* with the Chitral imbroglio, he has discovered other Arnawai rivers, several Bashgols, and one of the "very important Landai Sin." He adds that the river flowing through Kafiristan from the west into the Chitral or Kunar river, correctly called Arnawai by McNair and Woodthorpe, was also called "Bashgol" and "Landai Sin." The Arnawai or Bashgol valley was a populous district within the limits of Kafiristan, and, as regards that country of mountain fastnesses, of comparatively easy access to the onslaught of an invading force. It was this valley, as it will be remembered, that was excluded from Afghan dominion by the agreement drawn up at Kabul in November, 1893, between the Amír Abdur Ráhman Khan and Sir H. Durand. By that agreement we handed over to their hereditary and remorseless foe the brave people of Kafiristan, who for centuries past, aided by the difficult nature of their country, had been able with their bows and arrows to keep at a respectful distance their Afghan neighbours, not supplied with the modern arms of precision as they are now at the expense of the Indian taxpayer. Unworthy of us as this act was, it had this one redeeming point. The English agent who had been sent to Kabul to secure certain ends of our own expressly reserved the Bashgol or Arnawai, or Landai Sin region as that portion of the then existing Kafir country in which the Amír was at no time to exercise any interference. A year had scarcely elapsed before the Chitral difficulty presented itself—a difficulty, it may be remarked, from first to last of our own making. We knew that a word from the Amír at that time would have raised a hornet's nest about our ears. The march of a British force through a difficult country of some 200 miles, peopled by warlike and fanatical tribes, who look and who as long as he lives will always look to him for guidance, would then have been a hazardous as well as a ruinous operation of war in the existing condition of Indian finance. We also feared that he could not be otherwise than dissatisfied when he heard of our decision to retain garrisons in Chitral after we had proclaimed far and wide throughout the land that once our object was attained—the release of our Agent besieged in Chitral—no British force would be left beyond our own proper frontier. Accordingly in 1895 we handed over to the Amír the very tract of country peopled by the Kafir race that we had expressly reserved from Afghan dominion. In the Agreement—published as a Parliamentary paper during last Session—dated 9th April 1895, this Bashgol river is alluded to as the Landai Sin "notorious in Afghan idiom" and known under that name, and in the last article of the Agreement is said to have been

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

decided to pertain to the Afghan Government. As Colonel Holdich has now discovered another "Landai Sin" to the east of the Kunar river, it may be asked why the Landai Sin to the westward of that stream was described in the Agreement of 9th April of last year as the Landai Sin "notorious" in Afghan idiom? Was this alleged notoriety put forth and recorded in the Agreement drawn up between the English and Afghan Agents as a basis for the decision arrived at that it should thenceforth become Afghan territory? Considering what the nature of our embarassment was at the time as regards the Amír, we can at present only draw our own conclusions as to why this step was taken to gratify him at the expense of a helpless race. As regards official information on the subject all is dark. No papers as yet presented to Parliament throw any light whatever on the circumstances that led in the first instance—November, 1893—to our including Kafiristan within the Afghan sphere of influence with the exception of the Arnawai or Bashgol or Landai Sin valley, or, on those that led —April, 1895—to our withdrawal of that reservation. It is to be hoped that when Parliament meets, papers giving the reasons for these dubious transactions will be called for.

A "Missing Link."

AN Anglo-Indian correspondent writes: "Mr. J. M. Maclean, the member for Cardiff, in a recent letter to the *Times* raised an alarm that the Russians are securing all the trade in Central Asia. In skilful popular phrase, he went on to urge that railways should be pushed on from India to meet the Trans-Caspian lines; and sought to create an impression that this would be all that is needed, if not to supersede the Muscovite traders, at least to secure a considerable advantage for British commerce. In the present confused and morbid temper of the public mind regarding the race for 'new markets,' this high-flying scheme was quite good enough for the man in the street, and was greeted accordingly. And is not this grand: 'The whole distance from Chaman to the terminus of the Russian railway system on the north of Afghanistan is only 500 miles; and if this missing link were supplied we should soon have an overland line of railway from Calais to Calcutta [alliteration's artful aid] with the single break of the voyage across the Caspian Sea.' The eccentric physical geography of this scheme is well illustrated by those catch phrases, 'missing link' and 'single break'; and there is another single break omitted in this survey from Calais to Calcutta, that is, the 'Channel of Constantinople.' But as Mr. Maclean's scheme is to utilise the Russian railways, he will, at Batoum, find there is the whole length of the Black Sea forming a wide gap in his imaginary 'overland railway from Calais to Calcutta.' Mr. Maclean's audacity is worthy of him; but he presumes too much on even the mania for new markets—before the old routes are half utilised. And there is a bigger missing link in his scheme—conspicuous by its absence, that is, the cost, which would be magnificent. How would that be supplied? This indicates the minor premiss carefully shunned in his rhetorical and reckless project, namely, that as the basis of it is 'extension of the Indian railway system,' helpless, impoverished India would be expected to take the initiative and sustain all the risks!

Poor India pays.

"THAT Mr. Maclean knew he could safely count upon the true inwardness of his amazing scheme being overlooked in the present flighty condition of the public mind under its 'mania for new-markets,' is shown by an influential evening journal's rising to it open-mouthed, and responding with an air 'child-like and bland' thus: 'One fact is certain. Our authorities cannot defer consideration of the question of the junction of the Indian and Russian railways much longer'! As to the certainty of this writer's 'facts,' it may be noted that in quoting Mr. Maclean's 'from Chaman,' he interpolates '*on* our Indian frontier,' whereas that Afghan post is over 200 miles beyond our frontier; but that is a trifle with some people, seeing that wretched, helpless India has been compelled to attempt to bridge part of that barren, inhospitable interval with a military railway at the cost, already, of a couple of millions. The hardihood of thus cherishing an 'Imperial' vanity at the cost of 'other people's money,' is amazing, to put it mildly. Besides, the same writer opens his note on the absurd scheme with an odd delusion when he says: 'Surely the days of Russophobia are numbered when an Anglo-Indian and Tory M.P. is found advocating,' etc. It ought to be known that Mr. J. M. Maclean, M.P., is now, as he always has been, a typical Russophobist; only, for this occasion, he has the dexterity to turn his fixed idea the other way about. Let us, he says in effect, attack, smash, and supersede the Muscovite on his own ground in barren Central Asia; which, he asserts, 'needs nothing for the revival of its ancient fertility but order and good roads.' Here are omitted two very large factors—water and re-afforestation. The Russians, when not engaged in scaring our Simla Russophobists with strategical expeditions, are doing some little in that constructive direction; but they will require at least fifty years for that work—as also funds incalculable. The idea of compelling the Indian taxpayer to put his hand in his pocket for a Calais-to-Calcutta railway is a little too good."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE DUTIES IN INDIA.

SIR C. ELLIOTT'S "APOLOGIA."

I.—By HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.,
Sometime Secretary to the Government of Bengal, Member of the Viceroy's Council, etc., etc.

The current number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* opens with an article which has perhaps surprised some of those who call to mind the earlier reputation of Sir Charles Elliott. When he won his spurs, first as Secretary in the North-West Provinces, and afterwards as the guiding spirit of the Famine Commission of 1878, he was known as an advanced and ardent Liberal, too advanced, indeed, to thrive in the Conservative atmosphere of Indian official life. But this is an age of strange conversions and unexpected changes. The generation which has seen Mr. Chamberlain a prominent member of a Tory Cabinet, need not greatly wonder to find Sir Charles Elliott the opponent of a much-needed reform, the champion of an indefensible abuse.

The particular reform against which Sir Charles Elliott contends is the proposal to separate judicial and executive functions in Bengal, so that these powers shall no longer be united in the same individual. Whatever may be thought of his judgment, the selection of this topic is at least creditable to his courage. For the expediency of this reform is one of the few Indian questions upon which men of all parties and interests are agreed. Conservatives and Liberals here find themselves in the same lobby. Mr. Bhownaggree is the only Indian gentleman now in Parliament, and he sits on the Ministerial side of the House. But on this subject he is in full accord with the Opposition; and in a recent debate he emphasised his convictions by delivering an earnest and impressive speech in favour of this reform. The question is not one in which abstract arguments can be quoted on one side, and the weight of practical experience and authority on the other. Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley have both held the office of Secretary of State for India. They differ widely upon many points; but in their support of this proposal they are in complete harmony. It has sometimes (I do not say justly) been made a matter of reproach against lawyers, that they are slow to originate or to welcome reforms in legal procedure. But Sir Richard Garth, a late Chief Justice of Bengal, and Sir W. Markby, a late judge of the Calcutta High Court, warmly advocate the scheme. Sir Raymond West, formerly a judge of the High Court of Bombay, has added his testimony to theirs.

What, then, can have induced this new "Athanasius contra mundum" to resist a proposal recommended alike by authority and by reason? Is it possible that the secret is disclosed in the opening paragraph of the article? This reform, we are told, "is a leading plank in the platform of the National Congress party." And, a little further on, the writer refers to "Mr. Manomohan Ghose and the Congress party" in tones of unmistakable aversion and contempt. It is no doubt true that the people of India, speaking through their representatives in the Congress, have pressed this reform, among others, upon the Government, and Sir Charles Elliott has made no secret of his dislike of the Congress and its doings. But a man must think very badly indeed of the Congress, if its advocacy of a cause, however just and reasonable that cause may be, is alone sufficient to induce him to range himself on the opposite side. I cannot retort, even if I had wished to do so, by speaking of "Sir Charles Elliott and his party," for on this question I do not know that anyone agrees with him. But it should be remembered that the part of Athanasius is sublime, when he is the solitary champion of a valuable truth: it becomes ridiculous, when he is the last supporter of an exploded error.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, a well-known barrister of Calcutta, lately issued two pamphlets, one containing the opinions of eminent authorities on the union of executive and judicial functions, and the other a compilation of actual cases illustrating the evils and abuses of the present system. Sir Charles Elliott, in traversing this indictment, declares that—

> "The existing system has great merits and advantages, that it in no way trenches on the judicial independence of the subordinate magistrates, that there are weighty arguments against its modification besides those which arise from financial considerations, and that no valid proof has been adduced of any evil arising from it."

In support of this view, he lays down two propositions—first, that it is essential that the district magistrate should hold in his hands all the threads of the different branches of the Administration, and should have the officials in all those branches under his general control; and, secondly, that the subordinate magistrates ought to be advised, guided, and inspected by a superior officer, and that this end could not be attained if the control of the judge were substituted for that of the district magistrate. Sir Charles then proceeds to analyse the selected cases referred to by Mr. Ghose; and he comes to the conclusion that six of the cases are wholly irrelevant to the present issue; that in five cases there is nothing to show that the prevention of the magistrate's action would not have been pure loss to the administration of justice; that nine cases do not show the system to be a bad one, but simply "involve the personal equation of the magistrates concerned"; and that in all the cases, except one alone, "the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

acceptance of the reform urged upon us would have failed to remedy the injustice which was done or seems to have been done." "The attack, therefore, has wholly failed."

It appears to me that such statements as these, coming from a writer who has held the responsible office of Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, ought not to be passed over in silence; but that they should be examined, and (if it may be) refuted. I am not so sanguine as to hope to convert Sir Charles Elliott to my view of the question. There are those, of whom it was written of old, that they would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead; and their descendants are still among us. But I trust to be able to show, to the satisfaction of candid and impartial readers, that it is the defence, and not the attack, which has failed; that the present system is responsible for serious evils, which could easily be removed; and that in the interests of the pure administration of justice, of popular confidence in our tribunals, and of the credit of British rule in India, it is imperative that these scandals should be swept away, and that a strict line of demarcation should be drawn between the judicial and the executive departments.

Into the abstract merits of the question it is unnecessary that I should enter. That it is undesirable that the same person should at once be police-officer, prosecutor, and judge, is a proposition to which all will assent. What is contended is, that this system, though there may be objections to it in theory, works well in practice; that the evils which might be expected to arise from it do not actually occur; and that it possesses countervailing advantages of great weight and importance. How far this defence has been established, we are now to consider. But it should be borne in mind that the burden of proof is thus shifted, and rests upon those who uphold the present arrangement. That a system which is vicious in principle will naturally bear evil fruit, is a reasonable conclusion. It is for Sir Charles Elliott to show that this is one of those exceptional cases in which it is possible to gather grapes from thorns, and figs from thistles.

The first proposition is that it is necessary that the District Magistrate "should hold in his hands all the threads of the different branches of the administration," or, as it is put in another paragraph of the article, that "all power should be collected into the hands of a single official." One feels inclined to exclaim with Macduff,

> "What? all my pretty ones?
> Did you say *all*?"

Really, one would think that Sir Charles Elliott had never heard of District and Sessions Judges, Subordinate Judges, and Moonsiffs. The disposal of civil suits, and the trial of all serious criminal cases, are surely rather substantial "threads." There are many classes of offences which the Magistrate has at present no jurisdiction to try. Why should it be thought a monstrous proposal to prohibit him from trying any? He is incompetent to try a murderer; but we are asked to believe that the heavens would fall if he were forbidden to try a thief. Even in executive departments it is not accurate to say that the Magistrate is the centre of all authority. Sir George Campbell tried to make him so: but his system broke down under its own weight. He laid upon the shoulders of District Officers a burden too heavy for them to bear: and though, in the twenty-five years which have since elapsed, his policy may not formally have been reversed, it has been silently set aside, and there has been a steady movement in the opposite direction. The Post Office Department is not controlled by the District Magistrate: Education (other than primary) is not in his charge: he is no longer the *ex-officio* Chairman of all Municipal Committees. Registration and Public Works, and even Excise, are tending more and more to specialise themselves under their own departmental heads. And progress in this direction is inevitable, and will advance in the near future with accelerated speed. The system which Sir Charles Elliott applauds may do very well for a barbarous or half-civilised community: it is unsuited to the needs and circumstances of such a province as Bengal. It is, therefore, fortunate that this autocratic chief, who is fast becoming an impossibility, is not so necessary as Sir Charles Elliott fancies him to be. The success of our administration does not depend on the concentration of all power in the hands of one man, but upon all our officers making the best use of the powers they have. There are some powers which have been seriously abused, and which will always be abused, while human nature remains what it is: and it is for the public good that such powers should be taken away.

It is objected, however, that the District Magistrate really tries very few criminal cases, and that, therefore, the proposed reform would make no great difference. Such an argument shows an entire misconception of the nature of the evil, and of the operation of the suggested remedy. The mischief is done, not by the cases which the District Magistrate personally tries, but by his power to try such cases as he thinks fit; by his power to transfer a case from a subordinate who shows signs of independence, to one who will be a ready tool in his hands; by his power to interfere, at every stage of a trial, with advice which is equivalent to a command; by his power at once to conduct the prosecution, and to dictate the sentence. The cases which Mr. Ghose has quoted clearly show that these are no imaginary evils, but real and serious maladies, which will

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

assuredly recur so long as the present system is maintained. The remedy lies, not merely in relieving the District Magistrate of judicial duties, but in subjecting all judicial officers to the control and supervision of the judicial authorities alone. And this brings me to the second part of the argument.

It would be a fatal mistake, says Sir Charles Elliott, to put the Subordinate Magistrates under the Judge. It is most useful to them to receive guidance and counsel at the District Magistrate's hands; above all, it is of paramount importance that their work should be regularly inspected, a duty which is the breath of the Magistrate's nostrils, but which would be impossible to the Judge. I am at a loss to know how to deal with such baseless assumptions as these. Sir Charles seems to look upon the Judges as a kind of Gods of Epicurus, residing in some distant cloud-land, regardless of human affairs, and only awakened from their repose by the presentation of an appeal. Perhaps this is because he has never filled the office himself. Why should not the Judge be as competent as the Magistrate to guide and advise? Why should it be taken for granted that he will withhold all supervision, till a case comes before him in appeal? Why should inspection duty be impossible to him? In Maimansingh, where I was for some years Magistrate and Collector, there are four or five outlying moonsiffees; and these, as well as the offices at headquarters, were regularly inspected by the Judge. The value of the advice and counsel which Subordinates sometimes receive under the present system may be tested by a reference to No. 8 in Mr. Ghose's list of cases. The Subordinate in that case, acting upon the Magistrate's instructions, passed an illegal order, which was set aside on appeal. Sir Charles Elliott has the courage to dismiss this case with the brief comment that "it seems probable that the District Magistrate did nothing beyond what was expedient and for the public good." It is, apparently, for the public good that a superior officer should instruct his subordinate to violate the law. Another flagrant example is supplied by case No. 3. A Magistrate directed his Subordinate to sentence an accused person, then under trial before him, to the maximum punishment allowed by the law. This was a tolerably clear intimation that the Subordinate was to begin by finding the accused guilty. But Sir C. Elliott sees nothing improper in this. "Such an instruction," he quietly remarks, "may be expedient." The High Court, however, did not think so; as it promptly ordered the case to be transferred to the file of another officer, a conclusion to the story which Sir Charles has not thought worthy of notice. It may confidently be asserted that such counsel and guidance as were given by the Magistrate in these two cases would never be given by a Judge to his judicial subordinates; for a Judge may be trusted not to sacrifice justice to his own ideas of expediency.

So much for the "two definite propositions" of Sir Charles Elliott's article. Space limits will not allow me to examine in detail the cases quoted in Mr. Ghose's second pamphlet. I am not altogether sorry for this, for the pamphlet is a painful record of injustice, oppression, weakness, and folly. What, then, are we to think of a system under which these cases could occur, and what condemnation can be too severe for those who resist a reform which would make their recurrence impossible? Sir Charles Elliott, as might be expected, makes the most of the numerical argument. After all, he says in effect, there are only 20 or 21 cases in 20 years. Of course such bad cases as these are exceptional; if they were not, we should not be the rulers of India to-day. But the evil system, of whose working these cases are flagrant and outrageous instances, has been in operation all along, and is in operation now, to poison the springs of justice in the court of every magistrate in Bengal. These "horrid examples," of which Sir Charles Elliott speaks so lightly, are only types and specimens of hundreds more, in which similar injustice has been done, but there has been no publicity and no redress. And it is important to observe that recent instances show no signs of improvement. The case (No. 19) of the Rájá of Maimansingh, which occurred in 1892, is as bad as any of those which disgrace the earlier years of the series. It is clear that the disease is not dying out: it is necessary to stamp it out: and the time has come to apply the only remedy which will work an effectual cure.

But though I have not room to give a complete analysis of the cases, I must devote some lines to the excuses and apologies by which Sir Charles Elliott sometimes palliates, and sometimes boldly defends, the misdeeds of his clients, the District Magistrates. I will not pause to comment upon the cold cynicism of these remarks in the article, and the entire absence of any feeling of sympathy with innocent victims, who have suffered grievous wrongs. My opponent may say, and with perfect truth, that it was no part of his duty to indulge in sentiment. But the man is not to be envied who can peruse such a record as this without a blush of shame, or a throb of indignation.

Case No. 4 is summed up in the article with the remark that "this instance is altogether irrelevant to the issue before us: no injustice is shown to have ensued." The Magistrate, in this case, by an executive order, practically over-ruled a judicial decision, and then, when his illegal proceedings had been quashed by the High Court, issued instructions to his police which had the effect of setting aside the High Court's order, and depriving a number of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

fishermen of their property, which was handed over to the Magistrate's lessee, this lessee being an officer of the Magistrate's court.

Similarly, in case No. 5, we are told that "it is not alleged that any injustice was done to any one." A respectable man, the dewan of a Rájá, was arrested under a warrant on an unfounded and utterly frivolous charge, and the hearing was prolonged, under the instructions of the Magistrate, till the accused had been compelled to expend more than Rs. 10,000 in costs and fees. But in this case, as in the last, no injustice was done to any one!

Cases 6 and 7 are bracketed together in the article as if they were identical, and Sir Charles Elliott "does not understand the object with which these two instances have been included in the Memorandum." In No. 7 the only hardship was that it was necessary to incur the trouble, expense, and delay of moving the High Court, before the Magistrate could be prevented from hearing the appeal in a case in which he had been the virtual prosecutor in the court below. This was a defect in the law; and the Magistrate, to do him justice, was quite willing that another officer should hear the appeal. But in No. 6 the Magistrate actually opposed the transfer of the appeal, on the ground that the transfer would injure his prestige as the District Officer. It is strange that Sir Charles Elliott should have overlooked this material difference between the two cases, and that he should not understand their inclusion in the Memorandum. It is surely clear that if the appeals had lain to the Judge, and not to the Magistrate, which is the reform for which we contend, the cases could not have occurred.

On case No. 9 the comment is that "the Magistrate here appears to be totally free from blame." The Government, as represented by the Legal Remembrancer, thought differently; for, to escape the scandal of having the matter threshed out in the High Court, it allowed the vindictive orders of the Magistrate to be set aside without attempting to defend them.

No. 12 was a disgraceful instance of illegality and oppression; but Sir Charles Elliott urges that the District Magistrate was endeavouring to prevent (as he believed) a serious breach of the peace, and in such circumstances a little technical irregularity may be overlooked. No doubt there was danger of a riot; but the decision of the Sessions Judge makes it perfectly clear that the only rioters were the Magistrate and his party. The accused persons, who had committed no offence whatever, were eventually acquitted; but this was after they had been kept in custody for more than two months, bail having been illegally refused them, and after their crops on the disputed land had been destroyed. "It is quite clear," said the Judge, "that, from first to last, what the Magistrate was trying to do was to restore possession to the factory. This he had no right to do." These unfortunate men were illegally arrested, illegally kept in jail, and half-ruined by the destruction of their property: and this is what Sir Charles Elliott calls a little technical irregularity.

Case No. 15 was disposed of by the Lieutenant-Governor (Sir Stuart Bayley) in a Resolution which declared that there had been a grave misuse of judicial authority. Sir C. Elliott observes upon this, "I do not understand that this phrase was meant to apply to the District Magistrate himself." This is a surprising remark in face of the fact that the Resolution goes on to say, in words which Sir C. Elliott would do well to lay to heart, "The whole case is a striking illustration of the danger and inconvenience of the union of executive and judicial functions in the same officer, when that officer happens to be indiscreet and intolerant." The indiscreet and intolerant officer was no other than the District Magistrate himself; and the case originated partly in his arbitrary temper, and partly in his religious prejudices. To the persons who were harassed, threatened, arrested, fined, and imprisoned in the course of these proceedings, which extended over six months, it would be a poor consolation to be told that the matter was really of no importance, as it merely "involved the personal equation of the Magistrate." Sir Charles Elliott is mistaken in adding that the Magistrate could have acted just as he did, if the separation of his judicial from his executive functions had been carried out. He could not, in that case, have instructed the Deputy Magistrate to take action under Sec. 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code, nor could he have sanctioned a prosecution under Sec. 193 of the Penal Code.

He is mistaken again in his comment on No. 17, where he charges Mr. Ghose with error in quoting this case as an instance of irregular conduct by a District Magistrate. The only error is his own. Mr. Ghose nowhere says that the officer was the District Magistrate. The abuse which Mr. Ghose is combating lies in the union of the two functions in the same officer; and whether that officer is the District Magistrate, or a Magistrate in charge of a subdivision, makes no difference to the argument.

But these mistakes are trivial compared with the astonishing statement made in the penultimate sentence of the article, that "in all these cases, except one, the acceptance of the reform urged upon us would have failed to remedy the injustice which was done." The excepted case is No. 1 in Mr. Ghose's list. Even if the proposed reform were confined to depriving the District Magistrate of judicial powers, there are at least four other cases (Nos. 6, 7, 10, and Jitoo Lall's case in No. 12) in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

which it would have been effectual. But the claim of the reformers, as I have already pointed out, is not limited to this. It extends to a complete severance, in officers of all classes and grades, between judicial and executive powers and functions. Sir Charles Elliott cannot plead ignorance of this; for, as he has criticised and condemned Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt's scheme, he must be presumed to have read it; and in that scheme the nature and extent of the proposed reform are clearly and fully explained. This being so, I assert with confidence that not one of the cases in Mr. Ghose's list is irrelevant to the issue; that each and all of them would have been rendered impossible if the reform for which we contend had been carried out; and that, from the day on which that reform shall be enforced, such cases will cease to occur. This is not the place to discuss Mr. Dutt's proposals: I will only say, speaking as one who has had many years' experience as a Bengal Magistrate and Collector, that I believe that they are perfectly feasible, that they could be realised at a trifling cost, and that they would have a most salutary effect.

Sir Charles Elliott has thought it seemly to stigmatise one of Mr. Ghose's narratives as inaccurate and disingenuous. Whether these epithets would not be more fitly applied to his own article, is a point which I am contented to leave to the judgment of his readers.

II.—By Sir John B. Phear,

Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

A clever and astutely written article by Sir Charles A. Elliott on "The Separation of Judicial from Executive Power in India," which appears in the October number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, deserves and will doubtless command serious attention on the part of all who have at heart the welfare and good government of our Indian fellow-subjects. It proposes at the outset to show (1) that the existing combination of judicial and executive powers in the hands of the District Magistrate has great merits and advantages; (2) that it in no way trenches on the judicial independence of the Subordinate Magistrates; (3) that there are weighty arguments against its modification besides those which arise from financial considerations; and (4) that no valid proof has been adduced of any evil arising from it.

The writer establishes the first of these four heads in a very summary fashion by the simple statement that—

> "The keynote to our success in Indian Administration has been the adoption of the Oriental view that all power should be collected in the hands of a single official, so that the people of the district should be able to look up to one man, in whom the various branches of authority are centred, and who is the visible representative of Government."

The insinuation here that the system of administration of government under British rule in India owes its success to the fact that it has been moulded on Oriental lines, and is therefore specially suited to the genius and liking of the people, is certainly adroit. And to question the correctness of so agreeable an hypothesis might be deemed something worse than unpatriotic. Still it certainly is possible to find adequate causes, other than this happy approach to the result of a natural selection, to account for the centralised and autocratic form of the existing system of local administration. And as regards the administration of justice in particular, while assuredly it is not to countries governed according to "Oriental views"—Turkey for instance—that one would go for patterns of excellence, it is shown by the breadth and force of the long growing movement, against which the writer opposes all the weight of his personal authority, that it is precisely in this department that the autocratic government of the District Magistrate fails to secure the confidence of the governed. So much for the argument of success by reason of conformity to Oriental precedent.

To illustrate the thoroughness with which the governing Oriental principle has been applied, the article proceeds:

> "The Police Department, the Engineer Department, the Forest Department, the Education Department, the Sanitation Department, have all as they grew up tried to shake themselves free of the District Magistrate, but have been replaced in their proper position by such Lieutenant-Governors as Sir G. Campbell in Bengal, and Sir John Strachey in the North-West Provinces—not so as to cripple the power of the experts in each department, but so as to collect all the threads of government in the District Magistrate's hands, enabling him to use the knowledge of all for the purposes of each."

This is a very charming picture of happy family rule under a central benevolent autocrat. And we marvel at the folly of the little wandering sheep who attempted to stray beyond the reach of their ever-watchful shepherd! But in the very next line we meet with a remarkable and significant exception to the universality of the District Magistrate's authority:

> "In judicial matters the more responsible duties of Sessions Trials and the technical work of Civil Justice"—(a delightfully comprehensive phrase, by the way)—"have been placed in the hands of the District Judge"—(who, it should be here remembered, is a District Official co-ordinate with and independent of the District Magistrate)—"but there still remains under the District Magistrate's orders the body of Subordinate Magistrates, who dispose of the simple criminal cases and commit the graver to the Sessions, and the reasons which have been stated above apply with great force to the retention of their subordination."

It is not quite easy to gather from the article what the reasons here referred to specifically are,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

except so far as they can be summed up, so to speak, in the one object of collecting all the threads of government in the District Magistrate's hands; but the value of this particular thread must assuredly be small, seeing that admittedly it does not extend beyond the disposal of the simple criminal cases, while all the rest of the Department of the Administration of Justice within the district is excluded from the province of the District Magistrate, and entrusted to an officer who is entirely independent of him.

The writer of the article, without pursuing very closely the division of the text with which he set out, proceeds next to deal with the objections, which, he understands, are made by the Congress Party and Mr. Manomohan Ghose

"to two items in the District Magistrate's position: one is that he, being the executive head of the district, with direct control of the police, has the power of trying cases himself; the other, that Subordinate Magistrates, who try the great majority of cases, receive orders from him and look to him for such reports on their conduct and capacity as may expedite their promotion."

The first of these items he in effect gives up at once, for he admits, with regard to it, that "the District Magistrate does, as a matter of fact, try so few cases that no very serious evil would ensue if he did not possess the power." But he goes on to mention some grounds on which he thinks "it is well that he should retain this power," adding, "it is occasionally useful that he should take up an important and difficult case to set an example to his subordinates of the proper way of dealing with it." And finally covering his retreat with a fervid and indignant peroration, of which Mr. Manomohan Ghose will doubtless feel the convincing force, he exclaims:

"There is no real distinction in kind between the action taken before and after the trial. The police-officer is exercising a sort of judicial capacity, when he decides whose story he shall believe and which of two clues he shall follow up; the magistrate exercises a similar capacity when he believes or disbelieves the witnesses who appear before him on the Bench. To say that weak evidence will appear strong to him because he heard it before the trial, or that he cannot appreciate the force of new evidence because he did not hear it before, is unwarranted. To say that he will be so possessed with the passion of the hunter as to be incapable of listening fairly to any evidence in favour of the hunted, is a hypothesis unjustified by general experience or by knowledge of any but the worst sides of human nature."

We thus learn that the police investigation previous to trial, and the trial which follows thereon, are properly not distinct things, but are really one proceeding—the same in kind throughout; and it naturally follows that it must be an advantage to the officer who is charged with the responsibility of judicially deciding a criminal case to have had the conduct of the police enquiry from its commencement. On this principle it seems plainly to follow that the metropolitan police magistrates are an expensive and unnecessary luxury, and that in the interest of economy and justice they ought to be got rid of, and Scotland Yard to be entrusted with the disposal of their work. Perhaps it is wrong to attach any serious or definite meaning to this rhetorical utterance, but if it in any degree vaguely represents a view common to District Magistrates relative to the methods and rules of the English judicial trial, and the principles on which they rest, we can only conclude that the sooner these officers are relieved of the responsibility of having to set an example to their subordinates of the proper way of dealing with an important and difficult criminal case, the better for all concerned.

The more important item, however, of the District Magistrate's power is—so the article tells us—the second of the two items before mentioned by him—namely, his power of control over the Subordinate Magistrates, to be so exercised, it is admitted, as not to interfere with their judicial independence. Many illustrations are given of the sort of control which may be usefully exercised over, and of orders which may be given by, District Magistrates to their Subordinate Magistrates, without affecting the judicial independence of the latter. Prominent among them we find the following:

"If the order related only to a matter of procedure, as, for instance, if it directed a postponement of the case till fresh evidence, known to be on its way, could be produced; or even if it related to the penalty to be inflicted in the event of conviction, pointing out that certain classes of offences had become frequent and needed to be put down by severe punishment, or the reverse, then it cannot be asserted that any one suffered injustice."

Whether or not any one in such a case suffered injustice by reason of the District Magistrate's order, must depend upon the facts, whatever they were, and cannot be determined without knowledge of them; but obviously each of the alternatives here indicated is a gross interference with the functions of the Subordinate Magistrate responsible for the proper trial of the case, and directly affects his independence in the exercise of his judicial discretion. When, therefore, we find argument so essentially unsound as this employed to maintain the second item of the District Magistrate's power, we are justified in the conclusion that the case made out for it is even weaker than that for the first, in respect of which it is expressly stated in the article that no serious evil would ensue if the District Magistrate did not possess it.

This is not the place for a dissertation on the merits or demerits, or for an explanation, of the English method of trial and judicial determination of fact through the action of a competent and expert court, which, with certain exceptions, must be informed as to the facts solely through the oral

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

testimony of eye-witnesses, produced and tested before it by fitting examination and cross-examination on behalf of the parties. It is, however, of importance to bear in mind that in a criminal case one of these parties is nominally the Crown, and in reality the police authority. It goes therefore to the very root of the security for fairness and equity in the decision of the court, which is so carefully aimed at and provided for by the system, that the police authority should have immediate control over the presiding officer.

Probably the writer of the article before us, and those who share his views, are not accustomed to pay much consideration to this ingredient in the matter. Still, after all, it is through the English system of trial, and by the application of its principles, and not by any Oriental or patriarchal method, that justice has to be administered in India. Nor is this any new thing. In principle it dates from the time of Impey; it is established and prescribed in considerable detail by legislative enactment on procedure and evidence, and it may be said to have become an accepted institution of the people. And nothing is more certain than that it is of the essence of the English system that the court of trial should, in its whole action, stand absolutely apart from and free of subordination to the prosecuting or police authority, and should be in no degree under its influence.

If the yonnger and less experienced judicial officers are not fully equal to the duties of their posts, and require instruction or guidance in regard to them, it can surely be nothing more serious than mere matter of arrangement and money to provide these within the Judicial Department itself. At any rate, the District Magistrate does not appear from this article to be—and, indeed, his character of Chief Constable of the District prevents him from being—the best, or even a fitting quarter, in which to seek them.

A large portion of the article is devoted to the examination of a considerable number of cases, which have been put forward by Mr. Manomohan Ghose, and others, as examples of ill consequences attributable to the District Magistrates' power of control over the Subordinate Magistrates; and they are all made to emerge from the process in such a trivial shape, that one wonders how it ever could have happened that anyone should be deluded into paying them any serious attention, and strangely enough, too, it is discovered that very few of them are relevant to the purpose for which they have been cited.

The way in which this end has been achieved, and the value of the results arrived at, may be judged of from the two following instances taken from the article:—

"No. 2. A District Magistrate ordered certain persons to be prosecuted, and after the trial had begun before one Subordinate Magistrate, he transferred it to the file of another. The suggestion is made that he did this because he believed that the first Subordinate would acquit, but no grounds for this suspicion are given. The men were convicted, but the conviction was annulled by the High Court, who held that the Magistrate had no legal power to transfer the case. This instance fails to prove anything except a technical irregularity on the part of the Magistrate."

The facts of this "No. 2" are given at some length in Mr. Ghose's Memorandum, to which this abbreviated version refers, and are not here denied or disputed in any particular. It is impossible to read them without a blush of shame at the high-handed proceedings of the District Magistrate, and his straining of the power possessed by him over the Subordinate Magistrates, beyond its proper limits, purely in the interest of a personal friend who had broken the law, and to the grievous prejudice of the unfortunate villagers. The crying injustice of the case led to the interference of the Lieutenant-Governor of that time, and the whole of Bengal was excited by the scandal. Yet we have it here that this instance proves nothing except a *technical irregularity* on the part of the magistrate!

"No. 17. A land dispute had been depending for some time between two rival zemindars, neither of whom would give way. The sub-divisional officer, seeing that the dispute would lead them into great outlay, and might end in a breach of the peace, called in the two rivals and locked them up in his room till they settled their quarrel amicably; and when after a few hours they came to terms, he reduced their agreement to writing and jocosely told them that if either went back from his agreement he would have to pay a sum of money to the Dufferin Fund. Unfortunately, one of them did repudiate the agreement, and the High Court held that it could not be maintained as it was signed under compulsion, and censured the sub-divisional officer. I held that he certainly had acted in an extra-legal rather than a legal manner, dealing more as a schoolmaster with two boys, or a father with two sons, than as a magistrate—putting a half-humorous compulsion upon them for their own good, and that his motives were wholly laudable."

There is little need to amplify this version of the case by recourse to the fuller details of it which are given in Mr. Manomohan Ghose's memorandum. Sir Charles Elliott's account of the matter speaks eloquently for itself. The "rivals" who are locked up by the Government official in charge of the sub-division in a room by themselves until they settled their "quarrel" amicably, are two co-sharers of certain landed property, and their "quarrel" is a serious dispute between them as to the extent of their respective legal rights in the property. The "extra-legal rather than legal manner" of action of the sub-divisional officer, and "half-humorous compulsion upon the zemindars for their own good," are delightful phrases. Let us hope that the victims of the pleasantry duly appreciated its humour. Unfortunately (to use Sir Charles Elliott's own word), the High Court, in its judgment, expressed its

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"unqualified disapproval of the conduct of the sub-divisional officer in the matter," and took the unusual step of ordering a copy of its judgments to be forwarded to the Local Government. What the Lieutenant Governor thereupon thought and did in regard to the proceedings of his subordinate, Sir Charles Elliott's explanation now tells us; and we are, at least, in the position to admire the keenness of that high officer's sense of humour.

These two instances sufficiently illustrate the character of the criticism by which the cases of Mr. Ghose's Memorandum are individually dealt with in the article, and assumed to be demolished, and in each of them we find as in almost every other page of the article ample evidence to demonstrate how greatly the possession of uncontrolled executive power operates to disqualify an officer for the unbiassed and orderly exercise of the judicial function, as well as for the direction of others subordinate to him in the discharge of their judicial duties. Indeed, it is not extravagant to say of the entire article, its last paragraph notwithstanding, that it leaves the case which it attacks even stronger than it was before, and makes bare the inherent weakness of the arguments by which the continuance of the existing system is defended.

No doubt it is convenient to the Central Authority of Government and largely conducive to the smooth and efficient administration of public affairs throughout the country, that it should have a single Agent, rather than a plurality of Agents, in each District, endowed with large executive power, and having the strings of all the local departments of administration in his hand, to serve as the channel of necessary communication and direction. But this reason of governmental convenience and expediency by the nature of the case does not extend to the province of the courts of justice; and as a matter of fact only the lesser local courts of criminal justice are to any extent within the Government Agent's control. The Article assures us that it is "not in a vague term like prestige" that the argument for this limited control is based. And we cannot but feel that the proper designation of the cause, to which should be attributed the extraordinary reluctance that is manifested by Executive Officers to part with this small measure of control over the courts, is after all left unsatisfactorily obscure.

III.—BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

The difficulties of the question of the separation of judicial from executive functions in India receive unhappy illustration in the article contributed by Sir Charles Elliott to the current (October) number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. The tone of this article is of fine, old, matured, crusted Anglo-Indian quality; and the writer's attitude to Mr. Manomohan Ghose, whose statements and views he criticises, materially assists one in realising the unfortunate relations between Anglo-Indians and Indians, which cause so much friction as even to threaten danger to the Imperial rule. No doubt this tone and this attitude are unconscious—a sort of second nature—and this very fact is gravely significant. Sir Charles Elliott is confident that the combination of executive and judicial functions, so far from being a mistake and a source of injustice and oppression, "has great merits and advantages, that it in no way trenches on the judicial independence of the Subordinate Magistrates, that there are weighty arguments against its modification besides those which arise from financial considerations, and that no valid proof has been adduced of any evil arising from it." Accordingly, he endeavours to demolish the specific cases adduced by Mr. Ghose. Mr. Ghose is well able to speak for himself, but that fact need not preclude an independent consideration of the points in dispute.

Mr. Ghose has always been most careful to base his statements upon his own personal and professional experience. No man, outside the circle of Anglo-Indian officialism at any rate, will deny that his opinion is entitled to serious and respectful consideration, or will feel justified in suspecting that he is actuated by any motive except regard for the purity of the administration of justice. He is careful to point out that the object of his attack is, not individual officers, but the *system*. And what does he say?

> "The feeling of the thinking portion of my countrymen," he says in the January number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, "is that justice was, on the whole, never better administered in India than at present. This even-handed justice in all courts is the main cause of our contentment, happiness and loyalty."

"On the whole;" but there is a defect crying for remedy—a defect in the administration of the criminal law. "So far as the Government, the policy of England, and *even the majority of officials* are concerned, there is *no desire to unduly interfere*, but *the system works in such a way that the result does affect judicial independence*"—particularly in the case of the Subordinate Magistrates. "It may not be done intentionally, it may be through ignorance, but the effect of the interference is to make the Subordinate Magistrates feel that they have no discretion and no judgment of their own." The tendency to assimilate judicial to executive action on the part of the duplex officers is most natural, and might easily account for improper interference, quite unintentional as well as intentional. Mr. Ghose gives an instance of interference, adding the remark, "This sort of thing is of almost daily occurrence;" which may be taken to mean that criminal

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

counsel are perfectly familiar with such cases. Mr. Ghose refers to cases that he himself brought up to the High Court, with the result that the conviction was quashed. "Such a state of things," he adds, "causes much heart-burning among the people, who say, 'We cannot get justice.'" Again:

"Native magistrates, many my personal friends, have privately shown me documents which they could not make use of while in the service, asking me whether there was no remedy to a state of things which compelled them to decide a case as directed, or be told that they were insubordinate."

As regards even District and Sessions Judges, who are subject only to the High Court, "of late years," says Mr. Ghose, "there has been a tendency on the part of the executive to interfere indirectly even with their independence. District judges have recently complained bitterly of it." Why, the evil influence has even penetrated to the highest places. "The Bengal Government, or its secretary, only a short time ago published a resolution in the *Calcutta Gazette* censuring the Judges of the High Court for certain decisions they had given?" Well may Mr. Ghose, a trained and experienced lawyer, exclaim: "The idea of a secretary in a Government office censuring Judges!" Mr. Ghose concludes that the tendency of the system must be to demoralise even young English officials whose training has been "in a purer and healthier judicial atmosphere," while the effect upon native officials "is simply disastrous." Here is a large and most serious indictment. It is preferred, on personal and professional knowledge, by the foremost criminal lawyer in Indian practice. It demands a serious answer—either refutation or remedy. Sir Charles Elliott offers a refutation. What does that attempted refutation amount to?

It would be irrelevant to disarrange Sir Charles's rotund periods about "the keynote of our success in Indian Administration" and "the rulers who best understood the wants of the country." All this sort of superior assumption is eminently disputable. Anyhow, the personal opinion of an autocratic official is not to be taken for solid fact; and Sir Charles Elliott may be counter-balanced by Sir Lepel Griffin, who has publicly declared that, in his opinion, "there would be no inconvenience"—to say nothing of friction or danger—"in placing the whole of the Subordinate Magistrates under the Judge, and not under the Magistrate of a District." The passage that Sir Charles quotes from Sir John Strachey has the vice of proving a vast deal too much. It comes to this: that to restrict the Magistrate to executive functions solely would be "to deprive him of those powers which alone enable him to maintain his position as the local representative of Government." The argument means just this, if indeed it means anything honestly definite. In fact, the Magistrate would suffer in prestige. Sir Charles Elliott, of course, regards any interference with "judicial independence" as unjustifiable; and by "judicial independence" we take him to mean the absolute freedom of the Judge from control or influence in respect of the justice of any case that comes before him, and probably also any action of an executive official calculated to affect in any way the just determination of a case. Such, too, we apprehend, is Mr. Ghose's interpretation of the expression, though Sir Charles affects to sneer at Mr. Ghose's use of it. However, assuming that the right of executive interference is so limited, we venture to think that it will be no easy task to convince independent observers that the taking away of it would in the slightest degree affect the power of the Magistrate "to maintain his position as the local representative of Government." Without any such right, the Magistrate could perfectly well "collect all the threads of Government" in his hands so as "to enable him to use the knowledge of all for the purposes of each." Again, it may be advantageous for a young judge to receive hints of experience from a veteran in the service. But we are very well satisfied that, if young judges cannot be decently fitted for their duties before appointment, they should receive their lessons from the superior judges on appeal, and, if they are hopelessly backward, be dealt with by the Government on reports of superior judges that have sat on their judgments on appeal, or on local representations voicing popular dissatisfaction.

"The opponents of the system," says Sir Charles Elliott, "draw the picture of an officer who, because he has to some extent supervised and guided the police operations which end in the arrest of an accused person, becomes so biassed that he is unable to weigh aright the evidence which is produced on the trial."

Just ask an Englishman to combine in the person of the most estimable of police officers the functions of head constable and judge of his prisoners! Be the officer ever so honest, the suggestion need but be uttered to be scouted. Not a man in England would trust the two offices to the Lord Chief Justice—nor even to Sir Charles Elliott.

With regard to the class of cases just referred to—where the executive head of the district, with direct control of the police, tries cases himself—Sir Charles admits that such cases are so few "that no very serious evil would ensue if he did not possess the power." Such exceptional cases could easily be provided for otherwise; and the only argument of Sir Charles Elliott not already noticed—namely, that the law forbids certain offences committed by Europeans to be tried by native magistrates, that suspicion of bias or weakness might forbid political *causes célèbres* to be tried by natives, and that a lesson to a subordinate is occasionally useful—are too trivial to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

dwell upon. The real question lies with the other set of cases—those that come before the subordinate magistrates. Apart from the financial argument (which Sir Charles does not discuss), and the argument from the concentration of the threads of the different branches of Government in a single hand (which we have dismissed as valueless), Sir Charles Elliott relies on just one proposition more (the first half of which has also been dismissed as valueless), namely:

"that the subordinate magistrates derive great benefit from the advice and guidance of an experieneed senior when they are young, and from the inspection of a peripatetic officer whether they are young or old, and that the substitution of the control of the judge for that of the district magistrate would defeat these ends."

The judge would not be peripatetic; still, if it is impossible to get the work done by the younger officials without inspection, we do not see why peripatetic judges should not be told off to go on circuit. Fundamentally, however, we are exceeding sceptical about the value of this peripatetic inspection. So long as the record of every case can be called up by the superior judicial authority, and commented on fully and freely by technical experts, it is hard to see that an executive inspection is so utterly indispensable as to stand permanent in spite of professional and popular dissatisfaction with the practical results.

Sir Charles Elliott deals briefly with the cases cited by Mr. Ghose both in his *Asiatic Quarterly* article and in his Memorandum. To discuss each of these cases is manifestly impossible here; but some remarks upon them are necessary. First, however, we must notice a sentence of Sir Charles's, which seems intended to cast general discredit on Mr. Ghose's cases:

"The article," he says, "contains a good deal of vague assertion, such as 'the people say, We cannot get justice,' an assertion which can neither be proved nor disproved, but which is opposed to the experience of almost every careful and unprejudiced observer who has visited or resided in India."

Then, on Sir Charles's own statement, there are, after all, at least some "careful and unprejudiced observers" whose experience agrees with Mr. Ghose. We take exception to the allegation that Mr. Ghose's article contains a good deal of, or indeed any, vague assertion; and the example given by Sir Charles Elliott has been quoted above in its actual connexion. Mr. Ghose is evidently speaking as to his own experience, and such experience would afford not inconsiderable grounds even for a large generalisation, though it does not seem to us that he intends to generalise. If he really means people in general, then it is a mere quibble to say that the assertion "can neither be proved nor disproved." If a counsel in large practice for a quarter of a century says that such and such is his experience, there must be something in it that demands attention; it is exceedingly unlikely that the experience is unique. No doubt Sir Charles Elliott is a "careful and unprejudiced observer," and his official eyes have seen nothing of the kind. But what does that prove against Mr. Ghose? And how much is a Lieutenant-Governor permitted to see? And how much of that modicum does the prejudice of class and office lead him to ignore?

Besides the impossibility of dealing with Sir Charles Elliott's criticism of Mr. Ghose's cases individually, from sheer lack of space, there is the further difficulty of lack of information as to details. No doubt Mr. Ghose will furnish a fitting answer in due course. But take the first case. This is a case where a Deputy Magistrate, trying it, "said to Mr. Manomohan Ghose that he must do so and so because he had received instructions to that effect from the District Magistrate." Sir Charles Elliott complains that Mr. Ghose "has chosen to keep us in the dark" on the point of the whole case—namely, the exact terms of "must do so and so." What is "so and so"? "If," says Sir Charles, "it interfered in any way with the Deputy Magistrate's judicial discretion . . . . then it was indefensible, and Mr. Ghose would have scored a real point if he could have asserted this. But if the order related only to a matter of procedure, ... then it cannot be asserted that anyone suffered injustice." But what was the case adduced for, except that, in the judgment of Mr. Ghose as a criminal lawyer, the instruction *did* interfere with the Deputy's judicial discretion? Is Mr. Ghose to be set down as either a fool or a knave? Sir Charles knows better. Take the second case. The accusation was against the District Magistrate for thrashing a native, and the Deputy Magistrate, "without putting a single question, wrote on the complaint: 'The case is manifestly false. I dismiss it, and I call upon the complainant to show cause why he should not be prosecuted for bringing a false charge'." The District Magistrate, on hearing of the charge, at once admitted it, alleging great provocation. Sir Charles Elliott says he had personal knowledge of the case, and explains that the Deputy had just returned from some three months' leave, necessitated by "cerebral derangement" resulting from overwork and exposure. The Deputy was, therefore, irresponsible. His action in the case, the Chief Secretary to Government wrote officially, "is in the Lieutenant-Governor's (Sir Charles Elliott's) opinion inexplicable, except on the hypothesis that his mind has not yet regained its equilibrium." This *may*, possibly, be the true explanation. But *is* it so? How should Mr. Ghose know? Did an official, or any, surgeon certify it? Sir Charles must be aware that there are people perverse enough to adopt other explanations no less probable. The ebullition of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Deputy, in any case, conforms in a remarkable way to the general allegations in India as to the attitude of Anglo-Indians to Indians, and as to the relations of Subordinate Magistrates to their superiors. Enough. Let this sample suffice here. We venture to believe that we have said enough to justify readers of Sir Charles Elliott's article in holding judgment of its criticisms in suspense until Mr. Ghose—if he think it worth while—answers them in detail. More than that, if the reader will refer to the points of Mr. Ghose's indictment, briefly set forth above, he will see that there remain most serious allegations untouched by Sir Charles Elliott's polemic.[1]

OUR LONDON LETTER.

At a special meeting of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, held at the offices, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, on Friday, October 23rd, and attended by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. (chairman), Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. W. S. Caine, Mr. J. P. Goodridge, Mr. H N. Haridas, Mr. A. O. Hume, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. H. J. Reynolds, and Mr. W. Martin Wood, it was unanimously resolved, on the motion of Mr. Bonnerjee, seconded by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, that Mr. W. S. Caine be elected the delegate of the British Committee to the approaching meetings of the Indian National Congress at Calcutta. Mr. Caine leaves London on November 15th, and will sail by the "India." His proposed route in India is as follows: December 6—10, Bombay; 11, Gwalior; 12, 13, Agra; 14, Lucknow; 15, Cawnpore; 16, Allahabad; 17, 18, Benares; 19, 20, Dinapore, Bankipore, Patna; 21—31, Calcutta; January 2—16, Burmah; 20—25, Madras; 27, Sholapur; 28, Poona; 29, 30, Bombay; February 2—4, Karachi; 5, Multan; 6, 7, Lahore; 8, Amritsar; 9, Saharanpur; 10, 11, Delhi; 12, Jeypore; 13, Ajmir; 14, Ahmedabad; 15, Baroda; 16—20, Bombay, and sail for England.

In this connexion we may refer to the vacancy that has occurred in East Bradford, the constituency which was represented by Mr. W. S. Caine in the last Parliament, but which was regained by the Conservative party last year at the General Election. Mr. Caine had to decide between contesting the seat once more and going out to India to the Congress. Had the prospect of winning the bye-election been good, Mr. Caine might have felt it more important to get back to Parliament. But the party organisation locally had, we understand, been neglected, and an independent Labour candidate was in the field. Mr. Caine has therefore preferred to stand by his Indian engagements.

The two Blue-books (C. 8,258 and 8,259) which have just been issued as the "first report of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India," contain 586 and 412 pages respectively. It will be remembered that the Commission was appointed on May 24th, 1895,

"to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested."

The "report" proper occupies less than a single page. After reciting that the Commission began to hold sittings for the examination of witnesses on November 5th, 1895, and has since held 30 sittings, the report concludes:—

"We are not yet in a position to submit any recommendations upon the questions referred to us, but we think it desirable to lay before your Majesty, without delay, the evidence which we have hitherto taken."

The first volume consists accordingly of the minutes of evidence, introduced by a valuable analysis which fills some 44 pages. The evidence is divided into three sections dealing respectively with the financial machinery of the Government of India, the progress of expenditure, and the apportionment of expenditure in which both Great Britain and India are interested. For various reasons, we are informed, it was not found possible to complete the evidence in each section before taking up the next; but, with a view to keeping the sections distinct, the evidence relating to each head, even though not taken on consecutive days, has been brought together.

The second volume consists of appendices—that is, of documents handed in for the information of the Commission. These appendices, together with the evidence, contain a storehouse of information which, if not, like the history of Thucydides, a "possession for ever," will at any rate supply students of Indian affairs with much valuable information for many years to come. It is interesting to note that three of the most important documents printed among the appendices were put in by Sir William Wedderburn, M.P. These are a note on the Indian Budget of 1894-5, a note on Sir H. Waterfield's tables showing the progress of expenditure, and a memorandum putting into a convenient form the chief facts connected with expenditure during the past twenty years. We may add that the first and the last of these documents are dated from the office of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Sir Robert Low, commander of the Chitral expedition, was one of those who, on October 22nd, were presented with the freedom of the city of St. Andrews. In the course of a subsequent speech he permitted himself to use expressions that we may well contrast with the words of another soldier who, as Sir Robert Low will doubtless admit, enjoyed some reputation in India:—

Sir R. Low.
(St. Andrews. October 22nd, 1896.)

"It was well to recollect that they had won India by the sword, and that they held it by the sword, and if necessary they were prepared to defend India by the sword."

Lord Roberts
(House of Lords, July 20th, 1894.)

"The extraordinary position we occupy in India is mainly due to the natives' firm reliance on our integrity and honesty of purpose, and on our determination to do what is right and best for them. . . . . Our army in India is altogether out of proportion small to the extent of frontier which it has to guard, the enormous area over which it is scattered, and the population which it is supposed to control."

[1] A further article, by Mr. J. Dacosta, on this subject is printed at page 341.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1896.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.

The Royal Commission which, thanks to the persistent efforts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, was appointed in May of last year to enquire into "the administration and management of the "military and civil expenditure incurred under the "authority of the Secretary of State for India in "Council, or of the Government of India, and the "apportionment of charge between the Governments "of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes "in which both are interested" has at length issued the first portion of the evidence laid before it. The two Blue-books, which were laid in "dummy" upon the Table of the House of Commons before the prorogation of Parliament, and which, taken together, contain nearly a thousand pages, have been published just as we are on the point of going to press. It is impossible, therefore, in the present issue of INDIA to do more than briefly indicate the general scope of their contents. At the same time we present to our readers, in a separate Supplement, the full text of that part of the evidence in which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the "Grand old Man" of India, has had any share. It is the penalty of patriots like Mr. Naoroji to incur the fierce resentment of men who are equally incapable of appreciating their motives and of weighing their arguments. It was, therefore, to be expected that Anglo-Indian journalists of the baser sort, whose imaginations are not to be handicapped by mere facts, would distort and misrepresent the work of Mr. Naoroji, the Royal Commissioner, as they distorted and misrepresented the work of Mr. Naoroji, the member of Parliament. Every politician who does his duty fearlessly must run the risk of this kind of horseplay, and nobody could run it more cheerfully than Mr. Naoroji, whose indomitable perseverance, quiet sincerity, and nobility of purpose have, we do not hesitate to say, been a source not merely of admiration but of inspiration to many of the Englishmen of his acquaintance. Our Supplement, which is reprinted from the Commission's reports, is issued, therefore, not so much for the confusion of Mr. Naoroji's enemies as for the information of his friends. We may add that at a later stage in the proceedings of the Commission Mr. Naoroji will be called as a witness. This step is not only necessary to give authority to the important documents which Mr. Naoroji has handed in, but is eminently desirable in itself in view of his special knowledge and ripe experience.

The two volumes which Lord Welby and his colleagues have now issued are officially described as the "first report". But the report itself does not fill a whole page out of the thousand. The substance of it is contained in the single sentence: "We are not yet in a position to submit any recommendations upon the questions referred to us, but "we think it desirable to lay before your Majesty, "without delay, the evidence which we have hitherto "taken." This, it must be admitted, is a disappointing announcement. Indian questions "in "the lump" are so large and so intricate that every investigation of them is in danger of proving fruitless unless it disposes of the subject-matter piecemeal. This danger, which has been signally illustrated by the past history of Parliamentary enquiries into Indian affairs, led us at an early stage to express the hope that Lord Welby and his colleagues might find themselves able to issue *interim* reports upon the respective "watertight compartments" of the whole question referred to them. The adoption of this method seemed to have been secured when the Commission mapped out the field of its enquiries in three main sections: (i.) Financial Machinery; (ii.) Progress of Expenditure; and (iii.) Apportionment of Expenditure. The evidence which is now issued extends more or less, it is true, over all these sections. But it is concerned chiefly with the first—the question of financial machinery, which one would think it almost exhausts. We under-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

stand, however, that the preparation of an *interim* report upon this first section has been postponed on the ground that two or three important witnesses, who have yet to be examined, are expected to have something to say to the question of machinery. If this is the case, it can only be described as an unfortunate accident. We are very far from agreeing with the premature pessimists who say that no good can come out of the Commission. But we do not, on the other hand, disguise from ourselves (1) the fact that the terms of reference were by no means those which the Indian Parliamentary Committee desired, nor (2) the danger that, unless some mode of working piecemeal be contrived, the facts brought out by the Commission may be buried alive under their own excessive bulk. These two volumes are not, it must be confessed, an appetising bait to the "average sensual man," and to have waited to accumulate this mass of matter before communicating with the public is to put a premium upon human frailty and indifference. It is considerations like these that inspired our protest against the Commission's original resolution to sit with closed doors —a resolution which, we are happy to think, it has now, however tardily, reconsidered.

THE LIBERAL LEADERSHIP.

"OMNIUM consensu capax imperii nisi imperasset." If the epigram be not strictly applicable to Lord Rosebery, the fault lies in the word "omnium." Perhaps even if he had never become leader of the Liberal party, not quite everybody would have agreed that he was a fit and proper person for the post. What is certain is that between March 10th, 1894, when he became Prime Minister, and October 6th, 1896, when he announced in a letter to the chief Liberal Whip that the leadership of the party, so far as he was concerned, was vacant, Lord Rosebery disappointed the expectations of some of his admirers, while he incurred the unfavourable judgment of many sober critics. His retirement—the term "resignation" is hardly suitable—provided the newspapers with an absorbing topic for the greater part of a week. The silent acquiescence which has already superseded the excitement shows, rather pathetically perhaps, as Mr. Gladstone's resignation also showed, how easily a public figure fades into the shadow. It may well be, however, that this state of the atmosphere is not less favourable to a temperate survey of an important incident. Lord Rosebery's letter to Mr. Ellis left much to be explained. Three causes were mentioned for the grave step upon which the writer had determined—(1) "apparent difference with a considerable mass "of the Liberal Party on the Eastern Question," (2) "conflict of opinion with Mr. Gladstone," and (3) the fact that "scarcely from any quarter" did Lord Rosebery "receive explicit support." The letter added significantly that "this situation," except with regard to Mr. Gladstone, was "not altogether new." Obviously, therefore, it became necessary, as in the case of the Peloponnesian War, to distinguish the occasion from the cause. The distinction was pointed with sufficient clearness by Lord Rosebery himself in the eloquent, brilliant, and deplorable speech which he delivered at Edinburgh on Oct. 9th. That speech, far more effectively than his letter, "cleared the air." It showed that not merely on the Eastern Question, but throughout the field of foreign politics, Lord Rosebery differed fundamentally from the mass of the Liberal party in purpose, in outlook, and in mental attitude. It showed further that his position as titular leader of the Liberal party had long seemed even to himself untenable, especially because, to recall an earlier phrase of his own, the doors of the House of Lords "only open inwards." As for Lord Rosebery's attitude on the Eastern Question, the *Spectator* described him fairly enough as

> "sitting down groaning, but inert, with a confession that Britain has grown too fat ever again to make an exertion at the call either of civilisation or of her own honour."

Similarly Mr. Leonard Courtney, M.P., in an admirable letter which appeared in the *Times* of October 19th, wrote :—

> "What did Lord Rosebery say? He is full of indignation over Armenian horrors. He has seen particulars too foul to be made public. We have a right to interfere. But what then? We are distrusted, if not detested, by every European Power. And we are so weak with swollen Empire that we are under hostages for at least twenty years to come. The weary Titan has become a fat Falstaff, obese and floundering, gorged beyond digestion, incapable of action."

Liberals who desired not to provoke European war, but to give the Concert of Europe a "lead," were doubly disappointed that Lord Rosebery should urge such a conclusion at such a time. For they were disappointed to find that he regarded the British Empire as impotent, and they were also disappointed to find that, holding that view, he did not propose to remove the causes of impotence—"to purge ourselves," as Mr. Courtney put it, "of the causes of offence to "others and of weakness in ourselves"—but rather to dwell upon them as a basis of policy.

"I am ruminating," said Mr. Pickwick to Jingle on the coach, "on the strange mutability of human "affairs." When Mr. Gladstone, in June, 1886, referred to Lord Rosebery at Manchester as "the "man of the future," the promise of a distinguished career seemed to be assured. But it is interesting to note that some years afterwards—though before Mr. Gladstone's resignation—the author of a series

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of remarkably witty and far-sighted articles on "Our Public Men" wrote in the *Daily News* :—

"There is one good reason—perhaps two—why Lord Rosebery should not succeed to the leadership of his party. He sits in the House of Lords, and he will be urgently needed in the direct conduct of foreign affairs. The spectacle of a Prime Minister in a small and perpetual minority of legislators, whose right to legislate his followers denied, would not be dignified. The combination of the Foreign Office with the Premiership is the worst that could be imagined, and means either no Foreign Secretary or no head of the Government."

When Lord Rosebery succeeded to the Premiership he ceased, indeed, to be Foreign Secretary. But, as he has himself admitted, his imprisonment in the House of Lords subjected him to disabilities which, grievous as they were when his party was in Office, proved intolerable in Opposition. There is no need to discuss rumours, which may or may not be malicious, charging Lord Rosebery's colleagues with disloyalty to their chief. Nor need we attempt to answer the delicate question how far a strong and capable statesman in the House of Commons is, or ought to be, debarred from competing with a nominal leader in the House of Lords. But we imagine that few will be disposed to dissent from the following propositions: that a considerable section of the Liberal party strongly disapproved of Lord Rosebery's leadership from the first; that, having become leader, he caused much disappointment and embarrassment to loyal Liberals by a series of unfortunate utterances, beginning with his speech about the "predominant partner" and ending with his remarks on the Armenian question; and that, nowadays at any rate, it must necessarily be a grave cause of discomfiture to any Liberal leader, however strong, to be cribbed, cabined, and confined in the House of Lords. Hence it was, we take it, that the news of Lord Rosebery's retirement, except as regards the moment and the ostensible causes of it, hardly seemed surprising; and the efforts of a certain section to reinstate him in the position which he had abdicated were speedily abandoned. The Executive Committee of the National Liberal Federation carried on October 14th a resolution which amounted to a decision that things must take their course, and, at this moment, that is without doubt the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the Liberal party.

Yet it would probably be untrue as well as unkind to say that Lord Rosebery has a brilliant future behind him. His speech at Edinburgh certainly does not leave the impression that it was intended to be its author's last word to active politics. In this connexion, let us turn again to the keen observer from whom we have already quoted :—

"It is not Lord Rosebery's wit, nor his information—which is not, after all, out of the way—nor his easy, genial, and gracious manners which interest people most in him. There is great charm in mystery, and Lord Rosebery, perhaps as a result of his friendship with Mr. Disraeli, rather affects the mysterious. It is not, however, mere affectation. Lord Rosebery's character is not a simple one, and his career may yet puzzle those who think they know him best."

It seems to us that there was very much both in the manner and in the circumstances of Lord Rosebery's retirement to suggest not merely that he will be heard of, but that he will have to be reckoned with, in the future. We seem, that is, to detect more than a trace of implied menace between the lines, which causes us earnestly to hope that the Liberal party will, so to say, consolidate its judgment without delay on many important matters, not the least important being what is sometimes called "Imperialism." Meantime, the question as to who should succeed Lord Rosebery has settled itself. His own reference to Mr. Asquith, like his earlier and curiously similar reference to Sir Edward Grey, belongs to a future which is comparatively distant. For the present, at any rate, Sir William Harcourt, the superlatively able leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons, steps into the place which Lord Rosebery has vacated. The inevitableness of this succession was obvious at once to those who realised the exact situation that was brought about by Lord Rosebery's retirement. What Lord Rosebery did was to withdraw, not from any elective office, but from the vague and shadowy claims that are bequeathed to an ex-Premier by his expired Premiership. It has been well said that leadership of a party in Opposition is not an office at all, but a function. As, therefore, Sir William Harcourt was leader of the Liberal party in the House of Commons, and as no successor to Lord Rosebery as leader of the handful of Liberal peers could possibly supersede Sir William Harcourt in the estimation of the party, the leadership passed automatically to him—without, we may add, involving any fresh accession of substantial dignity or authority. The true test of leadership is, however, succession to the Premiership, which depends theoretically, indeed, upon the choice of the Crown, but really upon a Minister's ability to form a Cabinet and unite his party. The time for that test is not yet, and many things may happen before it arrives. But for the present, at all events, the Liberal party is led by a statesman who, as readers of INDIA may reflect with satisfaction, hates "Jingoism" and loves economy.

WALTER PATER'S LAST WORK.[1]

The "sadness of farewell" that we feel when the news first reaches us of a great writer's death is repeated as we finish the perusal of his posthumous

[1] "Gaston de Latour: an Unfinished Romance." By Walter Pater. Prepared for the press by Charles L. Shadwell. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

work, and realise, perhaps more vividly than before, the measure of our loss. Especially must this be the case when each book bears strongly the impress of the same individual genius, owes its charm to the same graces of style, or the same special gift of intuition and apprehension. Mr. Pater's last writings are not, as has so often happened with men of less power or less fortitude to bear success, inferior copies of his earlier work. Each of the volumes that came from the press during his lifetime, at long though decreasing intervals, had a character of its own and carried author and reader into fresh surroundings; yet in each the charm was essentially the same—every sentence, almost, was one that he only could have written precisely as it stood. And now we may add this further praise, with hearty thanks to Mr. Shadwell, his literary executor, for having carried out scrupulously what would certainly have been Mr. Pater's own wishes—that each of the three volumes published since his death (with the exception of a single unrevised chapter in this last, inserted to supply a necessary link) not only contains what the world will not willingly let die, but is as finely perfect, as free from signs of undue haste or want of revision, as the volumes that preceded. Let us hope that it will never be in the power of the strange species of hangers-on upon literature who prey upon fragments of forgotten manuscript, to detract from Mr. Pater's achieved perfection by the publication of what he himself would never have brought to the light. That kind of outrage upon literature is so serious, as well as so common, that reference to it is not wholly superfluous. But the particular degree of atrocity that would attach to it in this case can only be appreciated by those who understand what were Mr. Pater's methods of work. "I have known "writers of every degree," said Mr. Gosse in the interesting biographical study that he contributed to the *Contemporary Review* of December, 1894, "but "never one to whom the act of composition was "such a travail and an agony as it was to Pater. In "his earlier years the labour of lifting the sentences 'was so terrific that any one with less fortitude "would have entirely abandoned the effort. I recol- "lect the writing of the opening chapters of 'Marius,' "and the stress that attended it—the intolerable "languor and fatigue, the fevers and the cold fits, the "grey hours of lassitude and insomnia, the toil as at "a deep petroleum well when the oil refuses to flow." It is worth while to recall Mr. Gosse's description of Pater's actual method:

"So conscious was he of the modifications and additions which would supervene that he always wrote on ruled paper, leaving each alternate line blank. On this broad canvas of alternate lines Pater would slowly begin to draw his composition, the cartoon of what would in time be a finished essay. In the first draft the phrase would be a bald one; in the blank alternate line he would at leisure insert fresh descriptive ... parenthetical clauses, other adjectives, more exquisitely related adverbs, until the space was filled. might then be supposed that the MS. was complete. Far from it! Cancelling sheet by sheet, Pater then began to copy out the whole—as before, on alternate lines of copy-book pages; this revise was treated in the same way—corrected, enlarged, interleaved, as it were, with minute shades of feeling and more elaborate apparatus of parenthesis."

In Pater's case, at any rate, the definition of genius as "an infinite capacity for taking pains" was not so far from the truth as it sometimes seems.

But, of course, there was more in his genius than the taking of pains—first, and above all, that exquisite sensitiveness to external impressions that made it "almost physical pain" to him, we are told, "to be shown too much." This it is that gives their unique charm to his descriptions—his faculty for seizing and expressing those half-tones or subdued lights that the ordinary observer misses because they do not obtrude themselves upon him. "The "influence of cool places, quiet houses, subdued light, "tranquillising voices"—(the phrase is Mr. Pater's own, in a context that does not matter now)—we do not wholly miss the charm of these things, but the spell that they exert upon us becomes more intense from the day that we first read Mr. Pater.

"We're made so that we love,
When first we see them painted, things we have passed
Perhaps a hundred times, nor cared to see . . . .
Art was given for that."

It is not quite that; we did love these things before; but art makes us conscious of our love, and so deepens it for us. To each of Mr. Pater's sympathetic readers that happens, in some measure, which is told of his latest hero, Gaston de Latour:

"His new imaginative culture had taught him to value 'surprises' in nature itself; the quaint, exciting charm of the mistletoe in the wood, of the blossom before the leaf, the cry of passing birds at night. Nay! the most familiar details of nature, its daily routine of light and darkness, beset him now with a kind of troubled and troubling eloquence. The rain, the first streak of dawn, the very sullenness of the sky, had a power only to be described by saying that they seemed to be *moral* facts."

To this wonderful power of insight and interpretation were added other qualities. The range of his subjects was wide: early Greek religion, the native Italian religion, Plato and Platonism, Rome in Imperial times, the art and thought of the Renaissance, English poetry. The study that qualified him to write of all these subjects proved his "infinite capacity for taking pains" hardly less than his method of composition. And to treat of them all as profoundly as he did, he needed an intuition into the life and thought of other periods of history as subtle and penetrating as his intuition into the charm of certain aspects of Nature or of art. Once more, to the delicate sensibility of the ... have been added an almost equally

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

delicate sensibility of ear. Without this he could never have attained the exquisite modulation of phrase which, even taken by itself, stamps his work as a new achievement in English prose. Mr. Gosse's claim that his friend's writings have "already become "part of the classic literature of England" is not too strongly worded. There are passages in "Modern "Painters" that soar to greater heights than Pater ever reached, and their careless magnificence carries the reader captive more easily and more completely than Pater's quiet and careful elaboration. Pater, moreover, came after Ruskin, it is only just to remember, and learnt much from him in his earlier stages, however widely he departed from his master's style and doctrine as he came to his own late maturity. But when all deductions have been made, and when it has been conceded that Pater's style often carries over-elaboration to the verge of obscurity, one may still hazard the prediction that Pater's prose will maintain, like Ruskin's, a secure place among the glories of Victorian literature.

"Gaston de Latour," the unfinished romance now published in book-form, was probably begun by Mr. Pater soon after the completion of "Marius." Five chapters appeared in 1889 in *Macmillan*, and another in the *Fortnightly Review;* one new chapter only is added, as has been already mentioned, to supply a necessary link between chapters five and seven. "The work, if completed," says Mr. Shadwell, "would have been a parallel study of character "to 'Marius the Epicurean;' the scene shifted to "another age of transition, when the old fabric of "belief was breaking up, and when the problem of "man's destiny and his relations to the unseen was "undergoing a new solution. The interest would "have centred round the spiritual development of a "refined and cultivated mind, capable of keen en- "joyment in the pleasures of the senses and of the "intellect, but destined to find its complete satisfac- "tion in that which transcends both." A writer in the *Athenæum* states, as a fact of personal knowledge, what Mr. Shadwell suggests as a possibility, that the author was himself dissatisfied with the framework which he had begun and deliberately abandoned it. As the interest lies not in the plot, but in the mental history of an elect soul, or in the picture of the conflict of forces in an age of transition, the chapters that remain suffer far less from their abrupt termination than would be the case with an ordinary novel. We have pictures, complete enough in themselves, of Gaston, in the isolation of his boyhood, in a lonely French château; of his sojourn as a clerk in orders in the episcopal household of Chartres, and of the influence upon him, attractive and repellent, of the less sensitive minds of his associates and of the worldly bishop; of his sudden awakening to "modernity," to the over-mastering power of contemporary poetry, "as veritable, as intimately near, "as corporeal, as the new faces of the hour, the "flowers of the actual season." Then comes a visit to the pagan Ronsard, the poet whose influence had wrought such a change in him, at the priory of Croix-Val; and then a visit to the sceptical Montaigne, with his "keen, constant, "changeful consideration of men and things"; and, finally, after a dim vision of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, we listen with Gaston on Whit Sunday in Paris to a pantheistic sermon from Giordano Bruno, "that true son of the Renaissance," with his "large, antique, pagan ideas." Gaston had awakened, after his interview with Ronsard, to the consciousness of a conflict, no longer "mere bad-neighbourship," between two ideals that made rival claims upon him. The new religion of the Renaissance "came in part, avowedly, as a kind of conse- "cration of evil, and seemed to give it the beauty of "holiness." The story fails us before Gaston has made peace between the warring forces or found the solution of the world-old problem.

And so we come back to the "sadness of fare- "well." It is softened, however, by the thought that this volume and its fellows, unlike that which they most nearly resemble, the intimate talk of a wise and gracious friend, remain an abiding possession. Ever and anon we can escape from the noise and dust of life to these "quiet houses," absorb awhile their restful "subdued light," listen to their "tran- "quillising voices."

SIR C. ELLIOTT ON THE DEFENSIVE.

By J. DACOSTA.

In an article published in the October number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, Sir Charles Elliott, late Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, undertakes to defend the practice adopted by the Indian Government of vesting its collectors of revenue with judicial powers which enable them to sit in judgment over their own acts and the acts of their subordinates. Complaints of the miscarriage of justice and of grievous wrongs suffered by the people under a system so anomalous have been frequent for years, and have recently become louder and louder, owing to the persistent continuance of the evil. Referring to those complaints, Lord Kimberley, in May, 1893, admitted that the system was contrary to right and good principle, but pleaded that it was impossible at the time to find the financial means of making the necessary reform. The plea thus adduced for leaving the administration of justice in an avowedly impaired condition seems scarcely admissible in view of the millions of Indian revenue which are annually spent in trans-frontier expeditions for acquiring the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

territory of our Afghan neighbours, who give us no cause to fear for the security of our borders, and whose country is much too poor to yield any revenue adequate to the maintenance of a British garrison in it. Those expeditions have thus entailed a diversion of Indian revenue from its legitimate use—namely, the promotion of welfare among our Indian fellow-subjects. At the same time, the anomalous system of judicial administration, now defended by Sir C. Elliott, constitutes a breach of public faith as pledged by the British Government in the following passage of Regulation II. of 1793:—

"The Revenue officers must be deprived of their judicial powers. All financial claims of the public, when disputed under the regulations, must be subjected to the cognizance of Courts of Judicature superintended by judges, who, from their official situations, and the nature of their trusts, shall not only be wholly uninterested in the result of their decisions, but bound to decide impartially between the public and the proprietors of land, and between the latter and their tenants. The Collectors of revenue must not only be divested of the power of deciding upon their own acts, but rendered amenable for them to Courts of Judicature, and collect the public dues subject to a personal prosecution for every exaction exceeding the amount which they are authorised to demand on behalf of the public, and for every deviation from the regulations prescribed for the collection of it."

The highly beneficial results, both political and financial, of the *régime* inaugurated in 1793, are matters of history. They have been seriously impaired, however, by the subsequent revival of the condemned system of appointing revenue-collectors to preside in Law Courts—a system which obviously facilitates the enforcement of fiscal demands illegally assessed, and is repugnant to every sense of fairness and justice. Sir C. Elliott contends, however, that "the system has great merits and advantages, that it in no way trenches on judicial independence, and that no valid proof has been adduced of any evil arising from it." He goes on to say:—

"I cannot do better than quote from Sir J. Strachey's "India": 'We often hear of demands for the more complete separation of Executive and Judical functions in India; but they are demands based on the assumption that because it is good for England, it is good for India. There could be no greater error.'"

The argument thus denounced by Sir J. Strachey is no doubt puerile, and its inapplicability here is self-evident. But when and by whom has it been adduced? It does not appear in the petitions and other papers on the subject published in recent years. Sir C. Elliott further states:—

"The more important item in the District Magistrate's power consists in his control over the Subordinate Magistrates; and it is this which is attacked on the plea that he uses, or may use, this control to affect their judicial independence. I fully agree of course that any such interference would be unjustifiable; but I maintain that such cases, if they have occurred, have been most exceptional. . . . . That anyone should say to a subordinate 'I consider this man guilty and you must decide him to be so,' would be monstrous; but no one has asserted that interference of the kind takes place."

This concluding statement is calculated to cause considerable surprise to those who have informed themselves on the subject, seeing that, in some of the very cases commented upon in Sir C. Elliott's article, interference of the very kind he alludes to—namely, interference with the judicial discretion of a judge—was most prominently complained of; and the deliberate and continuous character of the interference practised, for example, in the Maimansingh case, together with its submissive acceptance by the Subordinate Magistrate, testifies that such interference was not exceptional, but habitual—a conclusion which is confirmed by the fact that the District Magistrate who committed that "monstrous" illegality was never punished for his delinquency. It becomes necessary to quote some particulars of the suit in support of the assertions just made—a task which offers, however, no great difficulty, as the proceedings in the trial were fully published.

Rájá Surya Kant Acharya, the victim in the Maimansingh case, is a wealthy landowner, much esteemed for his liberality and his public spirit. In August, 1892, Sir C. Elliott, when laying the foundation stone of the Maimansingh Waterworks, the erection of which was due to the Rájá's liberality, said: "The many acts of utility and charity of Rájá Surya Kant Acharya merit the esteem of the public, and he is reckoned as the leading benefactor of the district." The Rájá is the head of an ancient Bráhman family, and is said to be popular in society, with Englishmen as well as with his own countrymen. Nevertheless he incurred the enmity of the British authorities in Bengal under the following circumstances.

Certain prominent measures had recently been initiated by the Government, which caused great dissatisfaction among the people. Those measures were:—

(i.) The abolition of trial by jury for offences against the person;

(ii.) The appointment of a Government officer to assess Municipal rates and taxes; and

(iii.) The imposition on the Municipalities of certain financial burdens which had always been borne by the Imperial Treasury.

These measures, on being proposed, encountered intense and growing opposition from the community, and the Government took steps to get its own officers elected to preside over the Municipalities for the obvious purpose of overcoming the opposition. The District Collector-Magistrate of Maimansingh was accordingly nominated for the post of Chairman of the Maimansingh Municipal Board. But he was unsuccessful at the election, and ascribed his failure to the influence of the Rájá. He had previously sent

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a report to the Government, in which the following remarks were inserted :—

"The Rájá appears to be *facile princeps* in power and influence. He is a man of energy and determination and considerable force of character. A single powerful rich man can smash a Municipality with litigation. This deters the Municipality from effecting improvements which they would otherwise effect."

These remarks are reticent as to how legitimate Municipal improvements could be prevented, under the circumstances, by litigation. But they pointedly call the attention of the Government to the Magistrate's opinion, that the Rájá is a man who would have to be reckoned with when unpopular measures were contemplated by the authorities. It was accordingly devised to destroy that popularity and break that force of character which had been represented as mischievous; and the means adopted for executing that device were, to subject the Rájá to public humiliations calculated to lower him in the eyes of his countrymen, and impress him with the irresistible power of the Executive, and of the inutility of his opposing its will. In pursuance of that scheme a fictitious suit[1] was instituted, charging the Rájá with a public nuisance, alleged to have been caused through his interference with the flow of rain-water in a ditch which ran along a wall of his palace.

Before the suit was heard, a gang of labourers, accompanied by twenty constables armed with rifles, invaded the Rájá's palace, broke down the wall just mentioned, and cut a drain through the palace grounds, an order being sent at the same time to the Rájá warning him that, if he rebuilt that wall, he would be prosecuted for disobedience to the lawful order of a public servant. The intention of subjecting the Rájá to public humiliation was further manifested at the trial of the suit by his being made to stand in the dock by the side of a low criminal while the latter was being sentenced to imprisonment.

The trial was unnecessarily protracted for a week. At its conclusion the Rájá filed a Statement setting forth that the prosecution had been instituted and carried on without any reasonable cause, and amounted to a malicious prosecution; that there never was any nuisance; that the prosecutor must have been aware of the fact; and that a Statement signed by the prosecutor, and placed on the record of the case, contained assertions absolutely devoid of foundation.

Two days later the Assistant-Magistrate, who had tried the case, delivered his judgment, convicting the Rájá and sentencing him to a fine of Rs. 500, or imprisonment for twenty days. The Rájá appealed from this judgment to the Sessions Court of Maimansingh on the following among other grounds :—

That the Assistant Magistrate had been illegally and improperly influenced in his judgment by instructions and advice, written as well as verbal, given from time to time by the prosecutor.

That the Assistant Magistrate ought not to have permitted the prosecutor to converse with him out of Court or to advise or instruct him in any way regarding the case.

That the Assistant Magistrate, in ordering him to stand in the dock, acted in an illegal and unwarrantable manner, and that the sole object of doing so was to insult and annoy him.

That the Assistant Magistrate ought not to have placed on the record the statement drawn up by the prosecutor containing matters of prejudice against him and his Counsel.

At the hearing of the appeal, the Judge handed to the Rájá's counsel a letter he had received from the prosecutor desiring him to alter the charge on which the Assistant-Magistrate had adjudicated, alleging that the latter had intended to make the alteration while he was trying the case. Thereupon the Rájá's counsel said :—

"I must express my surprise that the Assistant Magistrate should so far have forgotten himself as to oblige Mr. Phillips with a note such as he wanted, more than a fortnight after the decision of the case. In his note (attached to Mr. Phillips's letter) Mr. Halifax not only says that he intended to convict the Rájá of a public nuisance, but ventures to accuse those who have alleged that the Rájá was acquitted of that offence, with 'wilful perversion of the truth.' I am one of those who made the allegation, and I emphatically repeat that Mr. Halifax acquitted the Rájá of that offence in spite of anything Mr. Halifax may now choose to say to the contrary, to oblige Mr. Phillips. We have nothing to do with Mr. Halifax's intention expressed more than a fortnight afterwards. Mr. Halifax is young and inexperienced, and the responsibility of this sad exhibition attaches to some one else who ought to have known better."

The hearing of the appeal presented other features also, which deserve the particular attention of the public. The Judge after stigmatising as "improper" the prosecutor's attempt to influence him in his judicial decision, said that the code of criminal procedure gave him the power to alter the conviction as suggested by the prosecutor; but that he would not avail himself of that power, because he thought that it was desirable that the proceedings should end in his Court. Why he thought so, and for whom it was desirable that the proceedings should not go further, the Judge did not say. But the point is explained by the fact that the Government particularly desire that appeals in cases reflecting on the conduct of their officers should be prevented, wherever possible, from reaching a High Court. This

[1] The suit is characterised as "fictitious" on the authority of the evidence produced at the trial, and of Sir C. Elliott's declaration in a Government Resolution promulgated by him with reference to the suit, in which he said: "Mr. Phillips's indiscretion is aggravated by the fact that he instituted a criminal prosecution for a nuisance without any complaint having been made to him on the subject, and without consulting a medical authority or a sanitary expert as to the existence of the alleged nuisance."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

explanation would scarcely apply if Sessions Judges in India were trained lawyers and independent judges. But they possess neither qualification. They are members of the Civil Service, depending for their advancement, in a great measure, on the goodwill of their employers.

The Assistant Magistrate's judgment was reversed by the Sessions Judge of Maimansingh, without the grounds of the appeal having been publicly examined, and the Rájá was left without any constitutional means of obtaining redress for the grievous wrongs he had suffered. The action of the Government officers concerned might, perhaps not inappropriately, be compared to a foul conspiracy, the partial success of which would not have been achieved, had the unprincipled system of vesting executive officers with judicial powers not been revived and continued as it has been, and had the purity and high tone of British Law Courts been carefully maintained in the provincial tribunals in India.

INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

HOW IT HAS GROWN DURING THREE DECADES.

We reproduce below a table giving a "COMPARISON OF THREE STAGES OF INCREASE IN INDIAN EXPENDITURE, during the last thirty years—that is from 1864-5 to 1894-5."

This statement, we understand, was placed before Lord Welby's Commission at a very early period in its enquiries, before any definite plan as to the course and scope of its investigations had been settled between the Chairman and his colleagues.

The compiler of the table, Mr. W. Martin Wood, was of opinion that some such compendious survey, at once concise and inclusive, of the Commission's chief field of enquiry, would prove useful. Experience has shown that those who plunge into enquiries connected with the huge, and, at first sight, complicated subject of Indian finance, are apt to become entangled in details and cross-references, thereby sometimes losing sight of the large totals and broad facts of the subject.

These broad facts are often as much as busy public men at home can readily take in, and they are sometimes sufficient for their guidance as bearing on the essential matters in respect of which they are required to exercise their independent and responsible judgment. It was, perhaps, partly for lack of some broad review and concise summary of the very valuable evidence, collected some twenty years ago, by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1871-4, that its *interim* and fragmentary reports, weighty though parts of them were, failed to make an adequate impression upon responsible statesmen of that period.

It is not claimed, we understand, that each set of figures in Mr. Wood's tables will coincide with corresponding accounts that may be eventually brought out in the Commission's report. But they are taken from the Statistical Abstracts and other official returns, so that whatever minor variations may occur, arising out of changes in the form of account since the earlier period, the comparison will, we believe, be found substantially correct.

Though the compiler of these tables—whose experience of Indian finance is closer, and dates from a longer period (save in one notable instance) than that of any member of the Commission—has not appended any note or argument to his comparison, its chief results will be appreciated even by the casual reader. Thus it will be seen that the annual State expenditure proper of India has increased by over sixty per cent. since 1865, and nearly thirty per cent. on the increased expenditure of 1875.

It is the enormous increase in India's charges since 1875 which is the great fact the Royal Commission has to take account of and record its judgment upon, for increase in annual outlay is still

COMPARISON OF THREE STAGES OF INCREASE IN INDIAN EXPENDITURE DURING THE LAST THIRTY YEARS, *that is, from June*, 1864-5, *to* 1894-5.

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE, ETC.	1864-5.		1874-5.		1884-5.		1894-5.		Increase.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
(*a*) GROSS EXPENDITURE	...	45,840,000	...	57,690,000	...	71,366,070	...	94,163,600	48,323,600
Deduct chief items of outlay not being Administrative Charges:—									
Opium—Cultivation and Collection...	2,325,780		2,560,300		2,966,640		1,646,400		
Salt—Production and Collection ...	462,130	...	492,680	...	449,328	...	497,600	...	
Railways—Working Expenses	1,565,430	...	4,085,000	...	12,949,306	...	23,629,400	...	
		4,353,340		7,137,980		16,365,274		25,773,400	
(*b*) STATE EXPENDITURE (Civil and Military)	...	41,486,660	...	50,552,020	...	55,000,796	...	68,390,200	26,903,540
(*c*) ARMY CHARGES (adding Military Works charged to Revenue and deducting Receipts)	...	15,888,060	...	15,584,600	...	17,456,424	...	24,334,800	8,446,740
(*d*) CIVIL EXPENDITURE (including Post, Telegraph and Mint)	...	25,598,600	...	34,967,420	...	37,544,372	...	44,057,400	18,458,800
(*e*) AGGREGATE (Net) MILITARY EXPENDITURE (in three decades)	... ...	Rx.162,464,818		184,929,075			220,563,743		58,098,925
To the decade ending 1884-5 must be added the contribution from the British Treasury, five millions sterling, approximately				5,850,000			(Includes Special Defence Works.)		
(*f*) PUBLIC DEBT at the period						190,779,075			
(*g*) COUNCIL BILLS drawn for in the year ...	...	Rx 74,457,681	...	69,757,678	...	93,132,425	...	104,349,278	Rx.29,891,597
(*h*) HOME CHARGES during the year		£26,125,100	...	48,876,116	...	69,271,088	...	116,109,490	£89,984,390
(*i*) EXCESS of India's EXPORTS over IMPORTS	...	£6,729,473	...	10,841,615	...	13,758,900	...	15,532,300	8,802,827
(*k*) ARREARS due from GUARANTEED RAILWAY COMPANIES for interest in excess of net earnings...	..	£4,997,495	...	12,905,585	...	17,527,406	...	15,594,500	10,597,005
	...	Rx,19,960,000	...	13,620,000	...	15,630,000	...	34,082,000	
	...	£6,650,000	...	£4,533,000		25,949,613	...	13,185,015	

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

going on. The most serious economical consideration in this connexion is that the increase is mainly in the unproductive portion of India's outlay, and in that which goes more than any other to swell the Home Charges, thereby making the burden on India's industry and revenues more difficult to bear. It will be seen from the tables that whereas the aggregate Military Expenditure in the decade ending 1874-5 was Rx.162,464,818, in the decade ending 1894-5, this unproductive outlay had reached the enormous figure of Rx.220,563,743; and, by the same token, the annual drafts of the Secretary of State at the latter period stood at nearly half as much again as in 1875.

Meantime the Debt of India has advanced by leaps and bounds. As will be seen from the table it was in 1894 about twice the amount it stood at in 1864-5. With regard to the sterling debt so largely increased even since 1875, there is this qualification to be noted—some ten to fifteen millions of it represent cost of the East Indian and other railway companies when taken over by the State, thereby so far reducing its item of "arrears due for Guaranteed Railway Companies."

SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S PROPOSAL FOR A COMMITTEE ON INDIAN FINANCE.

The *Manchester Guardian*, of September 28th, devoted its first leading article to a discussion of Sir W. Wedderburn's article on "The Indian Budget Farce," which appeared in our last issue. The *Guardian* wrote:—

If the expressions of regret so common after an Indian Budget sitting of the House of Commons that Parliament gives too little attention to the affairs of India are not mere platitudes, they are at least singularly fruitless. Our consciences are stirred for a moment, and then, unless some untoward event or some pressing question of policy arises, little is heard of India again in Parliament until, at the fag-end of another session, the annual Financial Statement is once more brought under the notice of a wearied House. An earnest protest on this subject, entitled "The Indian Budget Farce," appears in the October number of INDIA. The writer, Sir William Wedderburn, has had a long experience in the civil administration of India, and is one of the small band of men in the House of Commons who add to their knowledge a deep interest in its welfare. We may not altogether agree with his view that the annual Budget debate is a "discreditable farce," but every-one who is alive to British responsibilities and British interests in India is made painfully aware once a year, if not oftener, that the work of Parliament in the comprehension and control of Indian affairs is very slackly performed. This is not merely a question of conscience. Persistent neglect of an important duty brings after it, as a natural consequence, a loss, or at least a serious weakening, of authority. And there are signs of a tendency on the part of Indian administrative departments to act with less regard to the oversight of Parliament than they would if it were known that its control was steadily and effectively exercised. To say this is not to cast any slight upon the persons who carry on the administration of India. It is simply a matter of common experience that when those who are charged with high responsibilities give little heed to the duties which they involve, the powers attached to them have a way of passing partly or entirely into other hands. The appeal now made touches, therefore, very closely the self-respect of every member of Parliament and of every Englishman who has any care for the efficiency of British rule in India.

What is the remedy for a neglect of duty which is freely acknowledged? The quickening of public interest in Indian affairs sufficiently to impress our representatives in Parliament is hardly to be looked for, because, although many men and several constituencies are closely concerned in various ways with the welfare of India, those who have knowledge enough to be able to form intelligently founded opinions on Indian questions must always be a small minority. Some good may, no doubt, be done in this direction, but anything like effectual reform must proceed from a change in the method of dealing with these questions in Parliament itself. Place must be found for the consideration of the Financial Statement and of important questions of policy by the whole House before the minds of members have become jaded, or else these must be submitted to a specially appointed body. The latter is the course advocated by Sir William Wedderburn. Towards the close of last session he put forward a proposal to the effect that a Select Committee of the House of Commons should be charged with the duty of examining and reporting upon the East India accounts. This method would, he considered, be simply an application to the Indian Financial Statement of a practice already existing with reference to the accounts of the United Kingdom. The answer of the Secretary of State for India was remarkable. He denied that the control of Parliament over Indian finance could be made more real than it is, and held that the financial supervision exercised in India is "more efficacious than any control which could be exercised in this country would be." That is as much, or nearly as much, as to say that the submission of the Financial Statement to the House of Commons is a mere form. If that be the official view of the matter, it is surely one which cannot be acknowledged by Parliament without the virtual abdication of one of its most important functions. Writing in 1879, Mr. Fawcett said: "No one can reasonably desire that the English Parliament should perpetually meddle in the details of Indian administration. It should, however, never be forgotten that when the East India Company was abolished the English people became directly responsible for the government of India." A little later, alluding particularly to its financial administration, he enforced the necessity of "careful Parliamentary enquiry." He added: "Among the many reasons that may be urged in favour of such an enquiry, it may be mentioned that the experience of the past has shown that it is in the highest degree desirable that Indian affairs should be periodically investi-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

gated. In the days of the Company such an investigation was ensured at regular intervals, because the Charter of the Company, from which it derived its authority, was only granted for twenty years, and each renewal of the Charter was invariably preceded by a Parliamentary enquiry."

Other eminent authorities might be quoted to show that for years after India was brought under the direct administration of the Crown the control of Parliament was deemed a matter of the highest importance, especially in regard of its finances. To acquiesce, therefore, in the tacit assumption that the Legislature is incapable of properly exercising this function, and—still more important—to give countenance to it by neglecting to provide for its effective discharge, is to lower the dignity of that "Imperial" Parliament, of whose history and traditions we are justly proud. If we have indeed fallen so far below the standard of duty with regard to India, upheld in the past, as to give to its affairs only the miserable remnant of energy and attention which is left in the closing days of the session, the failure is the more remarkable in these days of large talk about Imperial union and a greater Britain. No body of men has been so persistently charged with narrow views of British obligations as those who were known by the name of the Manchester School. But it is impossible to read the speeches and writings of Bright and Cobden upon Indian affairs without observing the abundant thought which they had given to the subject and the largeness of their conception of our duties and responsibilities in the government of India. The questions with which they had to deal have in part been disposed of, but new ones, some of them not less important, are continually arising which Parliament cannot safely neglect or deal with slothfully. As some slight corrective to the general neglect of Indian affairs and interests by the House of Commons, as a whole, a certain number of its members have formed an "Indian Parliamentary Committee." This unofficial body, Sir William Wedderburn tells us, has, after careful deliberation upon the Financial Statements, submitted to the Secretary of State from time to time, and circulated throughout the House, explanatory notes upon these Statements dealing with substantial questions of account directly affecting the conclusions to be drawn from them. Work of this kind is of great value within certain limits. But it is not the work of the House of Commons as such, and necessarily it is carried on with imperfect information and with much feebler results than we might depend upon if some such proposal as that of Sir William Wedderburn were adopted. It is clear that this question of the better exercise of the authority of Parliament in Indian affairs demands earnest and thorough consideration, and we trust that attention will be drawn to it early in the coming session. Here, surely, is a call to private members of the House who have had no sort of official connection with the administration of India to take a deeper interest in the concerns of that country. Valuable as may be the presence in Parliament of retired Indian officials, it cannot be good that matters should be left entirely in their hands and in those of the representatives of the India Office. Neither Mr. Fawcett nor Mr. Bright was ever in India, yet the speeches and writings of these men bear witness to the abundant knowledge which they had acquired of its condition and needs, and to the high value of their counsel. What they have done others may do, and it would be difficult to imagine a worthier aim for a private member than in this great matter to follow in their steps.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

The following is a list of persons who are declared by the Civil Service Commissioners to have shown a competent knowledge of the subjects of the final examination of candidates selected in 1895 :—

Name.	Presidency or Division of Presidency to which assigned.	Marks obtained in the Final Examination.
Keith, William J.	Burma	1,766
Marris, William S.	N.W.P, etc.	1,698
Heycock, William B.	Bengal	1,676
Johnston, Frederick W.	N.W.P., etc.	1,648
Butler, Montagu S. D.	N.W.P., etc.	1,636
Asghar-Ali, Sheikh	N.W.P., etc.	1,628
Campbell, William E. M.	N.W.P., etc.	1,517
Humphries, Edgar de M.	N.W.P., etc.	1,511
Moberly, Arthur N.	Bengal	1,504
Stowell, Vere A.	N.W.P., etc.	1,492
Turing, Julius M.	Madras	1,488
Donald, James	Bengal	1,469
Jeffries, Francis J.	Bengal	1,468
Hammond, Egbert L. L.	Bengal	1,437
Gracey, Stephen W.	N.W.P., etc.	1,423
Rossiter Reginald A.	Bengal	1,413
Pringle, John C.	Bombay	1,398
Emslie, Harold H.	Bengal	1,391
Campbell, Archibald Y. G.	Madras	1,376
Thornton, Hugh A.	Burma	1,374
Balfour, Charles F.	N.W.P., etc.	1,363
Wilberforce, Samuel	N.W.P., etc.	1,362
Marr, William A.	Bengal	1,331
Palmer, Charles E.	Bombay	1,307
Braidwood, Harold L.	Madras	1,300
Stokes, Hopetoun G.	Madras	1,287
Holland, Robert E.	Madras	1,266
Duval, Herbert P.	Bengal	1,265
Yewdall, Frank	N.W.P., etc.	1,257
Coutts, William S.	Bengal	1,256
Pratt, Henry S.	Burma	1,246
Wilkinson, Charles R.	Burma	1,220
Fergusson, John C.	N.W.P., etc.	1,219
Clayton, Alfred H.	Bengal	1,206
Rose, Edward E. P.	N.W.P.. etc.	1,204
Kilby, Reginald G.	Bengal	1,183
Johnston, James L.	N.W.P , etc.	1,132
Wallace, Edward H.	Madras	1,129
Barniville, John J.	Bengal	1,118
Raw, William	N.W.P., etc.	1,110
Boyd, Frederick K.	Bombay	1,104
Stiffe, Norman C.	N.W.P., etc.	1,095
Mumford, Charles A,	N.W.P., etc.	1,085
Burton, Francis H.	N.W.P., etc.	1,070
Phelps, Edwin A.	N.W.P., etc.	1,060
Stow, Alexander M.	N.W.P., etc.	1,049
Panton, Edward B. H.	Bengal	1,048
Loxton, Charles W.	N.W.P., etc.	1,028
Rendell, Hugh D.	Bombay	1,024
Vernede, Arthur H.	Bengal	1,019
Monteath, George	Bombay	1,017
Waller, David G.	Madras	1,012
Bird, Benwell H.	N.W.P., etc.	990
Vernon, Charles V.	Bombay	986
Hall, Sidney C.	N.W.P., etc.	972
Skinner, Stephen S.	Bengal	971
Adie, Walter S.	Bengal	963
Chotzner, Alfred J.	Bengal	955
Smith, James C.	N.W.P., etc.	950
Graham, John F.	Bengal	865
Tupper, John H. E.	Bombay	857
Rogers, Cecil A. P.	N.W.P., etc.	809
Leftwich, Charles G.	N.W.P., etc.	739
Marten, John T.	N.W.P., etc.	696
Clarke, Charles A.	N.W.P., etc.	643
Hemingway, Percy	N.W.P., etc.	625

The seniority in the Civil Service of India of the selected candidates will be determined according to the order in which they stand on the list resulting from the combined marks of the open competitive and final examinations.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE COTTON INDUSTRY IN INDIA.

EXPERIMENTS IN THE GROWTH OF EGYPTIAN COTTON.

Mr. Jamsetjee N. Tata, a public-spirited citizen of Bombay whose name is well known throughout India, has just issued an interesting and important memorandum suggesting experiments on a large scale in the growth of Egyptian cotton in India. "The present state of our cotton industry is," he writes, "a subject of great anxiety, not only to the capitalists who have invested very large sums in the erection and purchase of buildings and machinery, but to all who have the well-being of India at heart. Our greatest reliance at present is on a foreign country—China. But there is an awakening of the nations of the farthest East. The new infant prodigy Japan is advancing in all the arts and sciences with leaps and bounds, and the old giant China seems to be just awakening from her sleep of ages. Then Germany, Austria, and Belgium have seriously come forward to compete with England in the effort to stuff us with their manufactures."

THREATENED DESTRUCTION OF INDIAN INDUSTRY.

Under these circumstances, "it has become an obvious necessity for us all to consider how our young and only industry is to be saved from threatened destruction."

By "us all" I mean, first and foremost our capitalists, who have invested their money in the industry; secondly, our rulers who know very well what a great stay and help it has been to the agricultural classes, who in many districts have been able only by the earnings obtained from our cotton mills to stick to their fields, and pay the Government cess readily; and lastly our educated and leisured class, which has lately awakened to the necessity of trying to do something for our poor and starving submerged class, which our best writers on political economy put at something like one-third of our whole population."

Mr. Tata earnestly invites the co-operation of all classes in a scheme which, he thinks, "may even become a source of great amusement as a rational pastime. I believe every professional man in India, whether in active business or retired, has some interest in land, and nothing can be easier than for anybody to try my proposed experiment on half an acre or so under his immediate supervision. No scientific methods are at all necessary. Any ordinary Indian khedoot can easily comprehend the principal essentials of the trial."

"ONE OF THE GREATEST PROBLEMS OF THE GENERATION."

"Our Government, with the organisation and money at their command, have often tried and failed, through no fault of theirs. Now, let us see if the people themselves, with their own means and with their own experience of ages, may not succeed on their own account. It is well known on what rock the Government experiments have split. There has undoubtedly been a greater reliance on foreign skill and experience, without sufficient effort to obtain any advantage from local and native experience."

If we look at the statistics of our foreign imports, our attention is at once rivetted by the enormous amount of grey, dyed, and printed goods we receive at our four principal ports. The sum of these imports totals up to an average of no less than thirty crores of rupees per annum. All these are principally made from 30s to 40s warps, and 40s to 50s wefts. Now, manufacturers know that it is hardly possible to make out of our Indian cotton warps above 30s to give the necessary production on our looms. Some passable wefts of the coarser grades may be made out of our home grown cotton; but for higher classes of goods, the use of exotic cotton is more or less necessary. Some mills, with the view of experimenting in the manufacture of these higher classes of goods, have been for the last two or three years using American and Egyptian cotton with some success. But the relatively high prices of these staples this year have nearly put a stop to these experiments. Now, if India were enabled to grow for herself the long-stapled varieties, she would derive immense benefit in three different directions:—

(1) Her agriculturists would have an additional and probably more paying crop to handle.

(2) The country would gain by having so much less foreign produce to import and pay for.

(3) The State would gain immensely in her exchange operations if India were not under the necessity of importing goods to clothe her people to very nearly the extent of 30 crores of rupees per annum.

Of course, all this is not to be attained in a year or even half a dozen years; but if the cultivation of Egyptian cotton proves at all feasible, it may be the means of solving one of the greatest problems of the generation.

A FAIR CHANCE OF SUCCESS.

The average out-turn of clean cotton all over India is, Mr. Tata says, below 30 lbs. an acre, and even in the most favoured Broach districts it is considerably under 100 lbs. an acre, while the average out-turn per acre in Egypt is over 600 lbs. As to value, while the Indian will not fetch more than an average price of 3½d., Egyptian cotton is worth over 5½d. per lb.

The climate and soil of Egypt are undoubtedly unique; but in this vast continent of ours we have such varieties of climates and soils that it would not be hard to be able to find all that we want in some parts of the Empire. As regards latitude, the cotton-growing zone of Egypt can easily be matched in our country. In Sindh and the Gangetic plains, and on the banks of many other minor rivers, besides similarity of situation and climate, we may find the rich silt which gives fertility to the Nile valley. The methods of cultivation are not at all high or scientific, and above the level of comprehension of our more intelligent cultivators. Between October and May, when according to my belief, Egyptian cotton may most suitably be grown in this country, our climatic conditions are as closely as possible like those of Egypt between March and October, between which months their crop is sown and gathered.

Previous experiments were not tried under suitable conditions. Such experiments were made to grow Egyptian cotton as a *Kharif* crop, while circumstances clearly show that the proper conditions cannot be obtained in India unless the crop be sown in the dry season as a *Rabi* crop. "From this, I do not hastily jump to the conclusion that Egyptian cotton, treated as a *Rabi* crop in India, is sure to succeed. What I contend for is the inherent probability, under the circumstances, of a fair chance of success. And as the cost does not promise to be ruinous, I believe it to be my duty, and the duty of every well-to-do native of this country, to lend a helping hand towards making a final trial of this most important experiment."

IRRIGATION AND SOWING.

In undertaking the trials, it is very important that as wide a field as possible as regards soil and climate should be chosen. At present it is contemplated to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

try experiments on about half a dozen one-acre plots in some well-known localities where the best varieties of cotton are produced.

The great difficulty is the question of irrigation. But as no natural irrigation is available in most of the localities pitched upon for the trials, we shall have to depend on the village well with the assistance of our bullocks and the leathern bucket. Of course, there are plenty of irrigable lands in various parts of India, but there are difficulties of distance and soils in the way, and I have thought it best to confine myself to such places where kind friends have undertaken to try these experiments, or look after them closely.

Mr. Tata appeals to all sympathisers for information as to any experiments already tried with Egyptian cotton. Especially he invites officials and residents in Sindh to experiment in their Province.

This Province in situation, climate, soil, and more especially in the orderly inundations of its chief river, bears such a close resemblance to Egypt, that to me it promises the greatest hopes of success in our experiments.

The eight months from October to May give us, as nearly as possible, the conditions necessary for growing cotton in Egypt, as well as the months during which most of our *Rabi* crops are grown. Local conditions of soil and rain-fall must guide every experimenter as to the exact time of sowing — whhether it should begin immediately on the stoppage of the rains at the end of September, or be put off till the middle of November. Also, the exact distance of the plants from each other must, to a great extent, depend upon the quality of soil, and the amount of manure. Every experimenter must depend on his own or some expert *Koonbi's* observation as to the time when the plants may require water.

As is well-known, the cotton plant strikes its roots very deep into the soil in search of water, very often to a depth of nearly twice its height above ground; and I would suggest to some experimenters who may have a deep rich black cotton soil available, to plant the seeds immediately after the rains, and let them grow and mature pods without any further watering. Of course, weeding and the necessary tillage must be proceeded with as usual. The manure may be worked in before the furrows are made, or if required in small quantity only, sprinkled by hand over the line in which seeds are to be planted.

How Bamian is Grown.

Mr. Tata proceeds to describe the methods pursued in Egypt in growing the long-stapled brown variety called Bamian.

For cotton culture the field must be well ploughed. As a rule, the plough must run over the field three times, an interval of ten days being allowed each time, in order that the sun and air may penetrate the soil. After that the harrow is passed over for the purpose of levelling the soil and breaking up the lumps of earth. Furrows are then made also by means of the plough, at a distance of one yard from each other, the breadth of the furrow included, which must be about ten inches, whilst the depth is to be the same. Between one plant and another a space of about one foot is to be left. The sowing is done about the 15th March, and in sowing, ten seeds are planted in the ground immediately under one side of the ridge, thus giving a lateral distance of one yard between one lot of seeds and another, but more than two plants are never allowed to grow together. All the others are plucked up. The more robust only are left. This operation is finished when the plants have obtained a height of 4 to 6 inches.

The first water is given immediately after the sowing, which is done while the ground is still dry. The second water is given after the seed has germinated, that is, after ten or fifteen days. Twenty days after, the ground is tilled and the weeds are removed.

The soil around the young plants is stirred up; it is then watered, and the superfluous plants are plucked up. Ten days after the fourth water is given, and when the ground is dry another tillage is done. At this juncture manure is put around the roots of the plants if the soil has not been manured after the first or second ploughing. The fifth water is given 20 to 25 days after, and the month of June is thus reached, when the ground is watered every ten days, till the end of September. At that period the first gathering is effected, and one more water is sufficient in the interval between the first gathering and the second. The above cannot be considered as fixed rules for watering. A great deal depends on the condition of the plant which will show whether watering is to be made earlier or later. The weather either dry or damp, the temperature more or less warm, as well as the nature of the soil, are so many indications likely to cause a modification of the system of irrigation.

Caterpillars and Fogs.

Cotton plants are subject to damage from (1) caterpillars and (2) fogs. The first can be destroyed, but not the second.

The cotton culture has been extended to Upper Egypt only of late years, and after material improvements have been introduced in the system of irrigation. A temperature of over 30" C or 80" F in the sun, is sufficient for cotton sowing. For the gining of cotton in Egypt Platt's Machines are used. Every gin yields 100 lbs. English nett of cotton per hour. The nett 100 lbs. of cotton represents one-third of the weight of raw kuppus, *i.e.*, 300 English of seed cotton passing through the gin every hour, turns out 100 lbs. nett. of cotton, and 200 lbs. of seed. Every factory possesses a gin called the "Affrite." This is of American origin, and is provided with a saw which serves to gin the scarto cotton, inferior, which falls with the seeds from Platt's gins.

India will have to begin in October instead of in March as in Egypt, and every operation must be performed at the same distance of time, but of course with such variation in time owing to difference in temperature, soil, etc., as may be taught by experience.

As far as ridging, tilling, etc., our rayats, especially of the Broach districts, know how to use their own implements to advantage. The sowing must of course be done by hand, after marking off the right distances. One object in tilling must be distinctly kept in mind. Remembering that the seeds are to be sown immediately below the ridge, the plants that grow higher than these ridges have to be gradually shored up by the soil forming the ridge, so that as they grow higher they should appear quite above the new ridge formed over their roots. The object of this is to encourage the growth of rootlets, which may imbibe moisture and nourishment so much more easily.

One thing the cultivator must not forget—that the crop in Egypt takes 7 to 8 months to mature, and most likely it may take the same time or a little less in India, according to situation.

This would take him quite to the end of May, or, very near the beginning of our rainy season. But the Egyptian cotton is very easily gathered, two pickings being finished invariably in the course of a fortnight. In Egypt, where the land is so rich, most often a second crop is grown on it, either clover or Jowaree. But with us, owing to the change of season, Jowaree or Muckai may be tried instead. But a good deal of manuring may become necessary for our soil, to enable us to raise this second crop.

Wanted: Co-operation.

"With these observations, and a reiteration of the request that gentlemen taking an interest in the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

matter will be good enough to communicate to the writer any information going, for or against, the conclusions he has attempted to draw, and also, without hesitation, to apply to him for any explanation or additional information that may be required, the writer begs to recommend his observations to all who take an interest in the material advancement of our country, and the well-being of its labouring poor."

Mr. Oscar Browning writes to the *Westminster Gazette* from King's College, Cambridge, as follows:

"In your note about Mr. Chatterjee's remarkable performance you omit one important aspect of the question: you urge that he should have been examined in India, but you do not remark that if he had been trained in India he might not have obtained his present distihction at all. Mr. Chatterjee was not educated at a private tutor's, but is a product of the University of Cambridge. His marks are now before me, and I observe that he was first in Poltical Science, first in Modern History, first in English History, and nearly first in English Composition, good in Political Economy and Economic History, all subjects forming part of the Historical Tripos in which he took his degree. He was also first in Sanskrit and good in English Literature, subjects which may be regarded as taking the place of Greek and Latin, which he did not offer. The remaining subject he offered was mathematics, in which he only did moderately well.

As Mr. Chatterjee's college tutor I may perhaps be allowed to say that in ability and in character he is, in my opinion, as well fitted to hold the highest posts in Indian administration as any Englishman who has entered that service by open competition. His claim to stand by the side of Prince Ranjitsinhji is that they have both met Englishmen on their own ground and beaten them. Neither one nor the other could have done what they have done if they had remained in their own country. Friends of India would be better employed in endeavouring to mitigate the absurd restrictions of caste than in advocating changes which would defeat the very object they have in view."

There are only two misapprehensions behind Mr. Oscar Browning's interesting letter, but they are serious ones. In the first place, so probable is it that, if examinations to the Indian Civil Service were held simultaneously in Calcutta and London, many more Indians would "meet Englishmen on their own ground and beat them," that the opponents of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's proposal base their opposition to it chiefly upon this probability. In the second place, "friends of India" (*vide* Hansard and the Blue-book *passim*) do not object to the requirement that successful candidates should come over to England and enter one of the older universities. What they object to is a system which imposes upon Indian parents a very heavy—and, so often, prohibitive—fine in order that their sons may have a *chance* of success at the first examination.

LECTURES OF ADAM SMITH.

Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue, and Arms. Delivered in the University of Glasgow by ADAM SMITH; reported by a Student in 1763, and edited with an Introduction and Notes by EDWIN CANNAN. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1896.)

On the face of it, there might seem to be a grave ground of objection to this resuscitated series of Lectures, in the mere fact that the MS. is not in the Professor's own handwriting, but is the work of a student. It is, one would think, enough to make a Professor turn in his grave to have his teaching handed down to posterity in a student's notes, unless the student was unusually capable. In point of fact, however, much valuable matter has come down to us in this very fashion. In the present case, fortunately, "we know," says Mr. Cannan, "that the disciple was both faithful and intelligent. We have most unusual means for judging of the accuracy of his work, and we find that it stands the severest tests in a manner which might be envied by a modern reporter with the advantage of shorthand." We may therefore be reassured as to the fidelity and discrimination of the student.

A second point of difficulty presents itself as a point of casuistry. Is it an act of impiety towards the memory of a great man to publish, by an evasion of his last wishes, literary matter that he undoubtedly wished to be destroyed? Mr. Cannan has persuaded himself that Adam Smith "would not have judged harshly of disregard of wishes more than a century old," and he relies on a text in one of the present lectures: "piety to the dead can only take place when their memory is fresh in the minds of men—a power to dispose of estates for ever is manifestly absurd." Further, he thinks it probable that if Adam Smith "had been acquainted with the criticisms which were to be passed upon his work, he would have withdrawn all objection to the publication of his Lectures." The real justification lies in the important light it throws upon the composition of "The Wealth of Nations."

In the first place, Mr. Cannan disposes conclusively of the belief, dating from the hasty and ignorant assertions of Du Pont de Nemours, that "The Wealth of Nations" was deeply indebted to Turgot's *Réflexions*, published some six years earlier in the obscurity of the periodical *Ephémérides du Citoyen*. The French work is not known to have been in Adam Smith's own library, and it was not in the Advocate's library at Edinburgh in 1776; and there is, in fact, no probability that Adam Smith had ever seen it before the publication of his famous book. The coincidences in doctrine are capable of the simplest explanation, apart from any charge of plagiarism. "But," says Mr. Cannan, "as it now appears that the resemblance between the *Réflexions* and the 'Lectures' is just as close as that between the *Réflexions* and 'The Wealth of Nations,' and as the *Réflexions* were not even written till after Adam Smith had ceased lecturing and had seen and conversed with Turgot, it may be supposed that the enthusiasts of plagiarism will now seek to show that instead of Smith stealing from Turgot the truth was that Turgot stole from Smith." For us, it is enough that Smith's independence is now placed beyond all rational question; we have no taste for vicious reprisals.

The manuscript of these Lectures is in the possession of Mr. C. C. Maconochie, an Edinburgh advocate, of a family of advocates. It is traced back to Mr. Maconochie's grand-uncle, whose name with the date 1811 is inscribed on it; and it cannot be traced farther. Mr. Maconochie regards it as impossible, in view of the dates and other facts, that either his grand-uncle, "or his father, the first Lord Meadowbank, or his brother, the second judge of that name,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

took the notes which were subsequently copied out." He is inclined to think that the book must have been bought "at a sale or elsewhere." The MS. appears to be a fair copy, and not the original notes taken at the lectures; and a fair copy, too, not made by the person who took the original notes. The copyist seems to have been a person of mature years, who often did not understand what he was writing. "He habitually makes nonsense of the argument by dividing sentences and paragraphs at the wrong place." Mr. Cannan works out all the points very fully and interestingly.

In particular, Mr. Cannan indicates the various elements of the present Lectures that were worked up into "The Wealth of Nations." He shows how we may "follow the gradual construction of the work almost from its very foundation, and distinguish positively between what the original genius of its author created out of British materials, on the one hand, and French materials on the other." He goes into this matter in great detail. This is the real importance of the new publication. The most substantial part of it consists of the treatment of "Justice." "The end of justice is to secure from injury. A man may be injured in several respects: first, as a man; secondly, as a member of a family; thirdly, as a member of a State." Accordingly, Adam Smith works out his subject on these lines. Of course, a mind like his must leave its mark, even at the distance of a hundred years, upon his work, and even when vicariously presented. But, in all essential respects, the matter is now belated. Mr. Cannan has corrected numerous blunders in his careful notes, but more remain behind. The points of Roman Law are often loosely grasped, and oftener still are loosely presented. It would seem as if Smith had depended mainly on Heineccius, and practised little the wise principle, *petere fontes*. Still, the blame must not rest on Heineccius, for it is obvious that Heineccius is frequently misunderstood, or inadequately apprehended. One cannot but doubt whether Adam Smith was ripe for a satisfactory handling of jurisprudence, up to the lights of his day and generation. After all, it is well to have the Lectures in the excellent typography of the Clarendon Press, and with the luminous introduction and notes of Mr. Cannan. Particularly welcome is the light they cast upon the genesis and construction of "The Wealth of Nations."

"HIS HONOR AND A LADY."

His Honor and a Lady. By SARA JEANNETTE DUNCAN, (Mrs. Everard Cotes). Illustrated by A. D. M'CORMICK. (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.)

"His Honor and a Lady," by Sara J. Duncan which, now published in a single volume, first appeared as a serial story in one of the Magazines (the *Pall Mall*, we believe), is an amusing, artistic, and in some respects instructive picture of official Anglo-Indian life. It is, perhaps, needless to say that the authoress is thoroughly master of the situation, and does not disfigure her work with any of the absurd blunders as to social conditions, which are characteristic of most English and American stories of Anglo-Indian society. Her earlier story of an unfortunate young Forest officer whose venerable aunt came out to India to visit him, and of all that befell her, will be remembered by many readers for its accurate delineations of Anglo-Indian life and of some types of Indians, selected mostly from that small body of servants, clerks, and toadies with whom alone most Europeans, are brought in contact. The present story is not perhaps quite as humorous as the previous one, but it is more earnest and more artistic, and is no less accurate in the portraits which it exhibits. True these portraits are not always of the most agreeable or deserving members of the community, and anyone would err who conceived that Anglo-Indian society was mainly composed of such persons. But none the less, all who have lived long in India have known there individuals who might have sat as the originals of each of these portraits.

We have spoken of this book as a story, but it is more properly a series of sketches. The story is of the thinnest and most elusive nature. The whole plot —if it can be called a plot at all—is that the Chief Secretary of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, (whose wife the said Chief Secretary is making love to), while pretending to support his chief in an important and unpopular measure, writes a vehement article against it and him in one of the papers, which contributes most materially to the decision arrived at by the Home authorities to require the Lieutenant-Governor to resign. The latter's unexpected death averts the necessity of a formal resignation, and after some little delay the Chief Secretary is appointed in his place. His programme is to go home after a decent interval and marry the widow, and he goes accordingly. But in the meantime she has become aware of his treachery to her late husband, and he returns to his Lieutenant-Governorship alone.

John Church, the betrayed Lieutenant-Governor, is a "loose-hung creature"—nervous, very obstinate, very well-meaning, and, let us add, rather a stupid, tactless being. Undoubtedly we have met more than one Bengal civilian whose characteristics are faithfully reproduced in John Church, but having known personally all the Lieutenant-Governors who have up to this day ruled Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab, we can unhesitatingly assert that there has never been a John Church amongst them, and we do not believe it possible that any John Church, as he is drawn in this story, could ever become a Lieutenant-Governor. Many worse men, many even more pig-headed men, have held the office, but none combining his special incapacities for rule could ever have risen to the position. The great so-called reform,* in an attempt to carry out which his career is supposed to have been wrecked—monstrous as it was in itself, and absurd as are the arguments by which he is supposed (page 176) to support it—need never have done him any harm had he gone about it with some little tact and circumspection, such as is forced by hard experience on even those naturally most hasty, in the long career that can alone be crowned with this high

* H. H. decided to withdraw *all* Government support from higher education, and devote the funds thus rendered available to the lower forms of technical education.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

office. The measure was a great and startling change, which involved the absolute reversal of the policy that had been endorsed and approved for fifty years by the Home Government and Parliament, and all previous Viceroys and Lieutenant-Governors, and though Mr. Church does appear to have talked it over privately with the Viceroy, he suddenly springs it as an accomplished fact, alike upon the members of the Viceroy's council, the Secretary of State and his council, the British public, and the native community. No man capable of such a proceeding could ever have become a Lieutenant-Governor, unless he had possessed, as a counterpoise to such extreme rashness, great qualities and capacities of which we find no trace in poor John Church.

Then again, in the case of the traitor Chief Secretary Ancram, we have known a man or two in the service *capable* of such rascality, and very like the portrait drawn, but not one in the position of a Chief Secretary (especially with Ancram's great abilities) who would under any conceivable circumstances have risked what the traitor here is supposed to have done. Fancy a Chief Secretary of *Bengal* writing an article (attacking his chief virulently) for a native newspaper, an article of such a character that if at any time thereafter it could be fathered on him, it must close his career—and a Chief Secretary, moreover, exceptionally worldly-wise and without the slightest belief in or sympathy with Indians or their aspirations. He might have written to the *Pioneer*, but never to the *Bengal Free Press*. The two principal male characters may be accepted as correct portraits of some men in the Civil Service, but these men never could have occupied the positions and acted in the manner that the authoress makes them occupy and act. The two "leading ladies" of the little drama, on the other hand, are quite natural and charming, and Miss Rhoda Daye and Mrs. Church, though their parts are subordinate to those of the two men, contribute far more than do these latter to invest with interest this little string of pearls (albeit some of them are a good deal off colour) of personalities and scenery. Of these latter we have as yet said nothing, but the whole work is full of delicious word-photographs of Indian scenes, which to us, at least, do not constitute the least charm of this pleasant and amusing series of sketches.

Take Rhoda at Darjeeling just before and just after she meets and has it out with the man she really loves, and, half-unconsciously, *has* loved throughout.

"Ten minutes later Rhoda stood fastening her glove at her father's door and looking out upon a world of suddenly novel charm. The door opened, as it were, upon eternity, with a patch of garden between, but eternity was blue and sun-filled and encouraging. The roses and sweet-williams stood sheer against the sky, with fifty yellow butterflies dancing above them. Over the verge of the garden—there was not more than ten feet of it in any direction—she saw tree tops and the big green shoulders of the lower hills, and very far down a mat of fleecy clouds that hid the flanks of some of these. The sunlight was tempting, enticing. It made the rubble path warm beneath her feet and drew up the scent of the garden until the still air palpitated with it. Rhoda took little desultory steps to the edge of the ledge the house was built on, and down the steep footway to the road. The white oaks met over her head, and far up among the tree-ferns she heard a cuckoo. Its note softened and accented her unreasoned gladness—seemed to give it a form and metre. She looked up into the fragrant leafy shadows and listened till it came again, vaguely aware that it was enough to live for. If she had another thought it was that Philip Doyle had come too late to see the glory of the rhododendrons, there were only, here and there, a red rag of them left."

They meet, are caught in a storm, and take shelter in a cave :—

"And so the storm swept itself away, and the purple-necked doves cooed and called again where the sunlight glistened through the dripping laurels, and these two were hardly aware. Then suddenly a Bhutia girl with a rose behind her ear came and stood in the door of the cave and regarded them. She was muscular and red-cheeked and stolid; she wore many strings of beads as well as the rose behind her ear, and as she looked she comprehended, with a slow and foolish smile.

"'It is her tryst!' Rhoda cried, jumping up. 'Let us leave it to her.'

"Then they went home through a world of their own, which the piping birds and the wild roses and the sun-decked mosses reflected fitly. The clouds had gone to Thibet; all round about, in full sunlight, the great encompassing, gleaming snows rose up and spoke of eternity, and made a horizon not too solemn and supreme for the vision of their happiness."

But the scene of the sketch is for the most part laid in Calcutta, and the vignettes of natural surroundings there are perhaps better than have yet been given to the world by any previous author. This will seem to many exaggerated praise, but we will reproduce a few passages to explain and justify our views :—

"Later Ancram stepped out of one of the open French windows and found her alone on the broad verandah, where orchids hung from the roof and big plants in pots made a spiky gloom in the corners. A tank in the garden glistened motionless below; the heavy fronds of a clump of sago palms waved up and down uncertainly in the moonlight. Now and then in the moist, soft air the scent of some hidden temple tree made itself felt? A cluster of huts to the right in the street they looked down upon half-concealed in a hanging blue cloud of smoke and fog. Far away in the suburbs the wailing cry of the jackals rose and fell and re-commenced; nearer the drub-drubbing of a tom-tom announced that somewhere in the bazaar they kept a marriage festival. But for themselves and the moonlight and the shadow of the creeper round the pillars, the verandah was quite empty, and through the windows came a song of Mrs. Delaine's about love's little hour."

Again, Mrs. Church is returning from a bazaar in aid of women's education, where she has received the usual floral offering :—

"The disc of pink-and-white roses rolled about with the easy motion of the barouche, on the opposite seat. It was only half-past four, and the sun was still making strong lines with the tawdry, flat-roofed yellow shops that huddled along the crowded, interminable streets. She looked out and saw a hundred gold-bellied wasps hovering over a tray of glistening sweetmeats. Next door a woman, with her red cloth pulled over her head and her naked brown baby on her hip, paused and bought a measure of parched corn from a bunnia, who lolled among his grain-heaps, a fat invitation to hunger. Then came the square dark hole of Abdul Rahman, where he sat in his spectacles and sewed, with his long, lean legs crossed in front of him, and half-a-dozen red-beaked love-birds in a wicker cage to keep him company."

She meets Mr. Ancram (the chief secretary) he joins her, and they drive out to Hastings House :—

"They rolled out into the gold-and-green afternoon life of the Maidan, along wide pipal-shadowed roads, across a bridge, through a lane or two, where the pariahs barked after the carriage and the people about the huts stared, shading their eyes. There seemed very little to say. They thought themselves under the spell of the pleasantness of it—the lifting of the burden and the heat of the day, the little wind that shook the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

fronds of the date-palms and stole about bringing odours from where the people were cooking, the unyoked oxen, the hoarse home-going talk of the crows that flew citywards against the yellow sky with a purple light on their wings."

Here again is a picture of evening on the Maidan:—

"The broad roads that wind over the Maidan were full of gaiety, and the definite facts of smart carriages and pretty, bowing women. The sun caught the tops of the masts in the river, and twinkled there; it mellowed the pillars of the bathing-ghats, and was also reflected magnificently from the plate-glass mirrors with which Ram Das Mookerjee had adorned the sides of his barouche. A white patch a mile away resolved itself into a mass of black heads and draped bodies watching a cricket match. Mynas chattered by the wayside, stray notes of bugle practice came crisply over the walls of the Fort; there was an effect of cheerfulness even in the tinkle of the tram-bells."

Of course, a fête given by some Indian noble comes on the tapis, and although we have already made rather too copious extracts, we cannot refrain from reproducing one little passage in regard to that fête:—

"The verandah was very broad and high, and softly lighted in a way that made vague glooms visible, and yet gave a gentle radiance to the sweep of pale-tinted drapery that here and there suggested a lady sunk in the depths of a roomy arm-chair, playing with her fan and talking in undertones. It was a place of delicious mystery, in spite of the strains of the orchestra that throbbed out from the ball-room, in spite of the secluded fans opening and closing in some commonplace of Calcutta flirtation. The mystery came in from without, where the stars crowded strewn thick and luminous behind the palms, and a gray mist hung low in the garden beneath, turning it into a fantasy of shadowed forms and filmy backgrounds and new significances. Out there, in the wide spaces beyond the tall verandah pillars, the spirit of the spring was abroad—the troubled, throbbing, solicitous Indian spring, perfumed and tender. The air was warm and sweet and clinging; it made life a pathetic, enjoyable necessity, and love a luxury of much refinement."

Everywhere the authoress's deep sympathy with the beauties and mysteries of the still life of the fettered East serves to glorify what but for this might be merely humorous and unconvincing.

One little point remains to be noticed. Miss Duncan is by no means a sympathiser with the Indian Reform movement, on the contrary, she, though in a kindly fashion, laughs at it, and caricatures, though not very ill-naturedly, the Indian Congress-wallah. She has no doubt whatever, one can see, that Europeans, foreigners and aliens to India's soil as they are, know incomparably better what is good for India's people than the Indians do themselves. But she is a conscientious artist, and while laughing at Indian agitation, she does not minimise its power and influence. Mass meetings on the Maidan and articles in the Indian press, backed up at home by friends of India's cause, *compel* the Secretary of State, most unwillingly, but still *compel* him to order the resignation of the offending Lieutenant-Governors. Before the Congress was initiated, India might pray and protest, petition and agitate from end to end, without producing the smallest apparent result; but now, after only eleven years of Congress work in India, and less than ten of that of the British Committee, the organised and consolidated voice of India has gained such volume that it has only to speak in earnest to secure the supersession of the next most important official in continental India to the Viceroy, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, the—but for India's growing voice—autocratic ruler of over sixty millions of Her Majesty's subjects. Nay, more, our authoress assures us that the teeth of Indian officialdom have been "drawn by the good friends of Indian progress in the English Parliament." Such testimony to the results achieved by their long and unwearied labours, given by one who in no way shares their enthusiasm or aspirations, ought really to encourage alike the Congress in India (the nucleus of India's future Parliament) and the British Committee here, to persevere strenuously in the good work for which they have already done and sacrificed so much, and which they both have so deeply and sincerely at heart.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

OCTOBER, 1896.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY. "The French and the English Views of India."

COSMOPOLIS. Müller, Prof. M. Max, "Indo-European Pre-historic Antiquities."

GEOGRAPHICAL JOURNAL. Curzon, Hon. G. N., "Pamirs."

GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE. Reid, Donald N., "Indian Agriculture and Indian Canals."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Satthianadhan, S., M.A., "Indian Students in England." G. F. S., "On Wheels in the West." Plumptre, Constance E., "On Adequate Knowledge of Ourselves and others." Brander, Isabel "Englishmen in India." Bannerji, J. N., "Some Notes on America."

MONTH. Cotton, L. Gordon, "Buddhism: The Burmese Phra."

PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Gough, General Sir Hugh, "Old Memories of the Indian Mutiny."

STRAND MAGAZINE. "Prince Ranjitsinhji." Interview.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

OCTOBER, 1896.

GASCOIGNE, GWENDOLEN TRENCH ..... "Among Pagodas and Fair Ladies." (A. D. Innes and Co.)	12s. 0d.
CROOKE, WILLIAM ..... "The Popular Religion and Folk Lore of Northern India." (A. Constable and Co.)	— —
PINCOTT, F. ..... "Prem Sagar." (A. Constable and Co.)	— —
FRAZER, R. W., LL.D. ..... "British India." (Fisher Unwin)	— —
DUNCAN, SARA JEANNETTE. ..... "His Honor and a Lady." (Macmillan)	6s. 0d.
RAMAKRISHNA, T. ..... "Tales of Ind, and other Poems." (Fisher Unwin).....	3s. 6d.
MIDDLETON, Rev. J..... "The Baba Log." A Tale of Child Life in India. (David Nutt)	3s. 6d.
C. S. ..... "Leaves from a Diary in Lower Bengal." (Macmillan)	— —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

REVIEW OF MINERAL PRODUCTION IN INDIA FOR 1895. By George Watt, M.B., C.M., C.I.E., Reporter on Economic Products to the Government of India. Government of India, Department of Revenue and Agriculture. (Calcutta, Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing)	12 As.
REVIEW OF THE TRADE OF INDIA IN 1895-96. By J. E. O'Conor, Director-General of Statistics to the Government of India. Government of India Statistical Bureau. (Simla, Governmental Central Branch Press)	— —

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.
CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 12. (NEW SERIES.)] DECEMBER, 1896. [Subscription, Post Free, Six Shillings per ann. In India, Six Rupees.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	353
Health Missioners for Rural India, by Miss Florence Nightingale	359
The Coming Congress, by A. O. Hume, C.B.	360
The late Mr. Manomohan Ghose, by Sir J. B. Phear	363
The Approach of Famine:	
I.—Retrospect: By an Anglo-Indian	364
II.—By an English Onlooker	365
"Health Missioners for Rural India": Government Letter	367
Robert Browning's Poems	368
The Expected Famine	369
Wanted: Checks on Expenditure	370
The Greek Lyric Poets	372
Our London Letter	374
"The Expected Famine":	
I.—How about "Exchange Compensation"?	376
II.—"The Sheet Anchor of Indian Statecraft"	379
III.—Speech by Lord G. Hamilton, M.P.	378
IV.—Some Remarks	380
Professor J. C. Bose	380
Reviews: The Baba Log	382
A First Book of Jurisprudence	383
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	384
Recent Official Publications	384

Indiana.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

LAST month we recorded Mr. Manomohan Ghose's triumphant vindication of the proposal to separate executive from judicial duties in India. To-day it is our painful task to chronicle his sudden and untimely death. India laments the loss in him of a great leader, the faithful friend of the poor and the oppressed. The Anglo-Indian journals join in the universal testimony to his character and ability. "His natural powers of mind," says the *Pioneer*, "would have been remarkable in any circle." "The union of irreproachable character and high philanthropy with such rare ability has," the *Times of India* writes, "fallen to few in a higher degree than to Mr. Ghose. Bengal is sensibly the poorer for having lost such a son." Sir John Phear, whose touching tribute to the memory of his friend will be found on another page, writes that "if any man can without qualification deserve the epithets true and good, they pre-eminently belong to him." Mr. Ghose, who was a loyal supporter of the Congress, had been chiefly occupied of late with the movement in favour of judicial independence, for which he spared no effort during the past twenty years. He did not live to see the actual downfall of the system which he condemned. But the battle is really won, and it was he who led the conquering army. If the ancient historian is right in attributing blessedness to those in whose case the hour of victory is the hour of death, Mr. Ghose may be said to have attained that blessedness. The tragic suddenness of his death came as a shock to all who knew him, both here and in India. His place cannot be filled. Only his example can be followed.

Village Sanitation.

WE are indebted to our distinguished contributor Miss Florence Nightingale for some further suggestions towards the scheme, propounded by her some time ago in our columns, for "health missioners" in rural India. Her proposal, which is set forth in her article on page 359 of our present issue, is that systematic teaching should be given in Indian villages upon the need of pure water and of the removal of refuse, and the dangers of overcrowding. The teaching, according to Miss Nightingale's admirable scheme, is to be given in lectures, followed up by practical work designed to meet the special needs of the individual village. Mr. B. M. Malabari has undertaken to co-operate in the Bombay Presidency, and it is to be hoped that many voluntary committees will soon be actively engaged in the work. The goodwill of the Government of India, as is shown by the circular printed on page 367, is already assured. But the women of India can do more in this matter than the Government of India. "To enlist the sympathy and gain the approval of the good mother who rules the home is," Miss Nightingale says, "the keystone of the whole position." Her watchword is "Small beginnings under favourable circumstances." The circumstances will not be favourable unless they

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

include sympathy and patience. Miss Nightingale's article has been written with immediate reference to the approaching Congress at Calcutta, to which, we venture to suggest, a special resolution on the important subject of village sanitation might well be submitted. The Congress has never been slow to consult the interests, and the practical needs, of the Indian masses. The scheme suggested by Miss Nightingale will, we have no doubt, meet with enthusiastic approval, especially at a time when the menace of famine is turning men's thoughts to the economy of the village. The subject is also one that appeals to Native States, and especially to such enlightened rulers as the Gaekwar of Baroda, whose zeal in the matter of sanitary education is well known, and the Thakore Saheb of Gondal, himself a student of medicine, and second to none in forethought for the health of his people.

Lord Welby's Commission.

WAS it not Callimachus who said, "a big book is a big evil"? Yet he had not seen the two ample Blue-books which were issued a few weeks ago by the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure. A Parliamentary Return showing the number of persons who have read, to say nothing of digesting, these thousand pages would be an interesting, though hardly a voluminous, document. Would it, we wonder, contain even as many names as there are members of the Commission itself? The Commissioners state in their merely formal report that they think it desirable to lay before her Majesty the Queen, without delay, the evidence which they have hitherto taken. One way of doing a thing without delay is to do it at once. But a majority of the members of Lord Welby's Commission, in the exercise of their discretionary authority, decided to sit with closed doors, and this decision was stubbornly maintained until the twenty-seventh sitting. Then —on July 15th last—reporters were admitted. Save for the last four of the thirty sittings, therefore, the evidence which is now reported to Parliament and the public is new. The result is precisely what, over and over again, we predicted it would be. The dose is too large. The patient is afraid of it. It may, of course, be the case that members of the House of Commons, in the retired pensiveness of the Parliamentary recess, are coming to terms with these bulky volumes. But then, again, it may not. As for the newspapers, they have for the most part, like prudent Levites, passed by on the other side. Even the few that have ventured to look into the volumes cannot be said, and probably would not claim, to have discussed them adequately. A leader-writer who, between the hours of nine and midnight, is required to "turn out" a readable column on a thousand pages of unfamiliar and unattractive facts may be excused for skipping and skimming. The subject would have had more chance if it had been vouchsafed to the world piecemeal.

The Origin of the Commission.

BUT it is idle to cry over spilt milk, and we must be content if, little by little, the superlative importance of the matter contained in these Blue-books comes to be realised by those who, where India is concerned, have ears to hear. Perhaps, in the first place, it may be of interest to glance back at the circumstances which led to the appointment of the Royal Commission. Its appointment was brought about by the unceasing efforts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee under the leadership of Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. The independent members of the House of Commons who seek to obtain a hearing for the unrepresented taxpayers of India asked year after year for a revival of the "stocktaking" which was periodic under the rule of the East India Company. At last, within certain limits, they were successful. In August, 1893, we recorded the formation of an Indian Parliamentary Committee "for the purpose of promoting combined and well-directed action among those interested in Indian affairs." In the debate on the Indian Budget on September 20th in the same year, the Indian Parliamentary Committee submitted, but were prevented from taking a division upon, the following motion:—

"That, in the opinion of this House, a Royal Commission should be appointed to enquire into the economic condition of the people of India, and their ability to sustain the present cost of the Indian Government, and also to consider what financial relations should exist between India and this country."

The motion was supported by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. Bayley. But Mr. George Russell, then Under Secretary for India, refused the proposal on the grounds (i) that Royal Commissions were required only where there was general ignorance of the facts; (ii) that they were "vast undertakings"; and (iii) that they were often used merely for dilatory purposes and led to no practical result. Accordingly, in 1893, the Indian Parliamentary Committee failed to accomplish their purpose.

The Terms of the Reference.

IN the following year, however, better fortune attended the efforts of Sir W. Wedderburn and his friends, whose number had in the meantime considerably increased. In the debate on the Indian Budget on August 14th, 1894, the Indian Parliamentary Committee concentrated their strength upon this important motion:

"That, in the opinion of this House, a full and independent Parliamentary enquiry should take place into the condition

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and wants of the Indian people, and their ability to bear their existing financial burdens; the nature of the revenue system and the possibility of reductions in the expenditure; also the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom."

Compared with the motion of the previous year, this motion exhibited, as will be seen, two points of difference. It asked for "Parliamentary enquiry" instead of a Royal Commission, and it expressly asked for enquiry into "the nature of the revenue system." The motion was supported by Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Herbert Paul, Mr. Seymour Keay, and Sir William Wedderburn. In reply, Sir Henry (then Mr.) Fowler "undertook on the part of the Government" that "at the very commencement of next Session" he would propose the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire into "the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues both in England and in India." Needless to say, what Sir H. Fowler undertook to offer was very much less than what the Indian Parliamentary Committee had asked. The terms of reference indicated in his speech ignored "the condition and wants of the Indian people, aud their ability to bear their existing financial burdens." They also ignored "the nature of the revenue system." Sir H. Fowler suggested a Select Committee on expenditure, and expenditure only. As we wrote at the time:

"The Select Committee which he has promised is to be interpreted as the thin end of the wedge. Full enquiry cannot be postponed much longer. Meanwhile, it is for the Indian Parliamentary Committee to turn the Select Committee to the best possible account."

It remains to be added that at the beginning of 1895 Sir H. Fowler, on second thoughts, proposed to appoint a Royal Commission instead of a Select Committee. This change had two advantages to recommend it. Unlike a Select Committee a Royal Commission (*a*) may include members who are not members of Parliament, and (*b*) is not terminated by a dissolution of Parliament. On the other hand, the terms of the reference to a Select Committee may be discussed in the House of Commons, while the terms of reference to a Royal Commission may not. Such discussion had been promised more than once by members who wished for ampler enquiry than Sir H. Fowler was prepared to allow. On May 24th, 1895, therefore, a Royal Commission was appointed, and the terms of reference were as follows:—

"To enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested."

Financial Machinery.

THE first topic which calls for notice in the evidence taken by the Royal Commission, and the topic to which we confine ourselves for the moment, is the financial machinery of the Government of India. We point out elsewhere the nature of the problem which this section of the evidence presents to the Indian reform party, and show that both Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour are of opinion that the Government of India does not give sufficient attention to financial considerations. What is the remedy? Neither of them puts forward a complete and definite scheme of readjustment. But their evidence contains more than one important suggestion. Sir Auckland Colvin (Q. 3,123) thinks that the direction in which the remedy must be sought:—

"would be the strengthening of the financial interests in the Council of the Secretary of State, and ultimately in trying in some way, without undue interference with the authority of the Government of India, to establish a control emanating from what theoretically is at present the last court of control —Parliament."

Sir David Barbour enters into further detail as to the nature of this improved Parliamentary control. He says (Q. 2,235):

"I should think it would be a very good thing, especially as regards Indian affairs, if, when Parliament had to do with them, it appointed a Select Committee to report from time to time upon particular things; that, I think, would be very good. It would be most dangerous if Parliament interfered without first taking the report of a Select Committee or of some other special body."

But this Committee, apparently, should not in Sir D. Barbour's judgment deal with details but only with large financial issues. He says (Q. 2183):—

"I think that the general control of Parliament over Indian expenditure and over Indian matters generally is most valuable, and I should be very sorry to see India removed from that general control. But I must say that I think that when Parliament interferes in particular matters, it generally interferes on very insufficient information, and I am afraid that it does rather more harm than good. I have the highest opinion of the value of the general control of Parliament over Indian expenditure; I think I may say I have almost a terror of its interference in details."

These, it would seem, are the most important texts which Lord Welby and his colleagues will have to consider when they come to frame their recomendations as to financial machinery. Perhaps we may add another from Sir Auckland Colvin, who states (Q. 2912) that "from the point of view of finance the military department is the most disturbing." Here, for the moment, we leave the subject. Enough has been said to show that Sir A. Colvin and Sir David Barbour are prepared to go a long way in the direction of the proposal for a Parliamentary Committee on Indian Finance, which was urged by the Indian Parliamentary Committee in the last debate on the Indian Budget. The Royal Commission resumes its sittings in January next. If it should draft an *interim* report on financial machinery, we trust that a majority of the members will realise the paramount importance of placing the salary of the Secretary of State for India upon the British Estimates.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The Expected Famine.

As we go to press news of a slightly reassuring character reaches us with reference to the Indian Famine. Lord George Hamilton's latest telegram from the Viceroy is, it is true, hardly less dismal than its predecessors have been. But the Allahabad correspondent of the *Times*, under date November 22nd, telegraphs that a storm which two days before struck the Bombay coast caused rainfall throughout eastern Rajputana, and reached the western parts of the North-West Provinces; that good rain has fallen in Meerut and fair rain in Agra; and that there are signs that the rain may extend further. All this is very much to the good, and already we read such hopeful calculations as that "1½ in. of rain over the provinces within the next fortnight would reduce the difficulties by a half to three-quarters." It is earnestly to be hoped that this more sanguine tone will prove to be justified, and that the worst disasters may yet be averted. Meantime the Lord Mayor of London announces that he is in close touch with the Indian authorities and the Secretary of State, and that he will open a national relief fund "the moment they apprise him of the necessity for that course." Our readers will observe that a large part of our present issue is devoted to a topic which for the time being necessarily takes precedence of all others. To what is said elsewhere we may add here that the present is the time for bringing into full play the machinery which the Local Government Acts ought to have provided in India. We say "ought to have," for we fear that many magistrates have steadily set themselves to obstruct and minimise the proper working of the Acts. Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has done good service in directing attention, in the letter which we reproduce on page 378, to the paramount importance of the native village system. In this connexion we may well refer to a lecture which he delivered before the London Institution in December, 1883, upon "The Indian Rayat as a Member of the Village Community." The Report of the Famine Commission was then recent. But Sir W. Wedderburn asked:—

"Have the people of England at all taken to heart the lessons taught by that enquiry? The enquiry showed that the existing system had entirely failed to prevent a most appalling loss of life. Do the people of England understand that what is wanted is a complete change of system? Do they realise that the cause of our failure is to be found not in the details but in the very principle of our official rule in India, which has upset all native methods and seeks to regulate according to European patterns the affairs of 250 millions of Orientals? . . . It is the old fable of the bundle of sticks. Singly the Indian cultivator is weak and has but a feeble hold upon existence; united in the village community he is strong, both in his ordinary rustic well-being and in his power to resist the great periodical calamity of famine. But the very existence of the village system is threatened by the gradual encroachments of centralised departments, active and self-confident, very much in earnest, devoted to uniformity, and little inclined to tolerate either local peculiarities or local independence. Ever since the British rule has become consolidated, a struggle has been going on between these two forces; between Native local custom on the one hand, and European official innovation on the other. For the rayat this is a question of life and death."

How has the struggle ended? "In every department," Sir W. Wedderburn pointed out, "—land revenue, civil justice, forests, irrigation, police—we find that, with the best intentions and with immense official labour, we have broken up the solid old foundations and built upon the sand an alien system entirely distasteful to the people and unprofitable to ourselves." Is it not time to retrace our steps—which can be done "if we proceed with caution, and experimentally"?

The "Experts" Again.

In that singular document, the Agreement signed April, 1895, by Mr. Udney and the Sipah Salar Ghulam Haidar Khan (the Joint Commissioners for laying down the Afghan boundary from the Hindu Kush range to Nowar Kotal) the Bashgol stream is described as the river "which in the idiom of the Afghans is notorious and known as the Landai Sin pertaining to the limits of Kafiristan." As we mentioned last month Colonel Holdich, who was with Mr. Udney while the demarcation of the frontier was being carried out, recently announced a subsequent discovery of his of "one other very important" river of the same name, which, he says, is also called the Swat River. Whether this river is also "notorious in Afghan idiom" under the name of Landai Sin Colonel Holdich does not tell us. But as to whether the Bashgol stream of Kafiristan was really a household word among Afghans under the name of Landai Sin, we have been for some time a little suspicious. However this may be, we have now had given to us in the clearest terms, not only the meaning of the words Landai Sin, but also the description of the particular stream which has been generally known to the Afghans by that name from time immemorial. For this information we have reason to be grateful, especially as it comes from one whom we believe to be more intimately acquainted with the geography of the region lying immediately beyond the North-West frontier of India, as well as with the language, traditions and feelings of the wild Pathan tribes inhabiting that region, than any of the so-called frontier "experts" of the day. Major Raverty, a retired officer of the Bombay army, whose knowledge of the countries in question "with ample page rich with the spoils of time" dates back nearly half a century, writes in the *Geographical Journal* for November, with reference to this last "discovery," that any small river is called Landaey Sin (not Landai) by the Afghan people dwelling near it. "Land," Major Raverty explains, "is the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Pushto adjective for 'small,' 'little,' etc., and the diminutive form of that adjective is *Landaey* for the masculine singular, *Landai* for the feminine, and *Landi* for the plural, masculine and feminine. Sin or Sind, a corruption of the Sanskrit *Sindhu*, means a sea or river; consequently any small river would be called the Landaey Sin without that being the roper designation of that river."

The "Scientific" Frontier.

As to Colonel Holdich's "very important" Landai Sin being called also the Swat River, Major Raverty says that this is a great mistake, inasmuch as it is only after the Swat river has joined its waters with those of the Panj-Korah, and after they have united with the Kabul River at Do-bandi, that the stream flowing eastwards thence to Atak is called—and then only—the Landaey Sin or Little River, as distinguished from the Aba Sin or Father River—the Indus—into which the united streams fall at the latter place. This, *the* Landaey Sin, as we may now regard it, is shown, Major Raverty adds, in the map of the Mullah's Explorations in 1876. In "An Account of the Province of Peshawur" published in 1852 in the *Transactions of the Bombay Geographical Society*, Major Raverty described the Landaey Sin, as it was also further described by him in no fewer than three different works of his published subsequent to 1852. It would, in fact, seem that Major Raverty knew all about the river known to the Afghan people generally under the the name of Landaey Sin before probably many of the frontier "experts" of the present day were born. Under the circumstances we can be scarcely wrong in believing that if there is any stream in the country of the Pathan tribes dwelling north of Peshawur that can claim to be generally known to them under the name of Landaey Sin it is that portion of the Kabul river that flows between Do-bandi and Atak. All the more puzzling, therefore, is it to account for the Eastern water-shed of the Bashgol river of Kafiristan, a district then peopled by Kafirs, and in which no Afghan at that time dared to show his face, being described in the Agreement of April, 1895, as the Landai Sin "notorious in Afghan idiom." Was it for this reason that the British Commissioner agreed then and there to the people of the valley being handed over to the Afghans, their hereditary foes, without a thought as to what the fate of these poor people would be? It is difficult to believe this; but yet the thing was done, making manifest the political ineptitude of the whole of our transactions with the Amír Abdur Rahman Khan, dating from the so-called Durand Agreement of November, 1893, as well as the folly and wickedness that have attended our proceedings beyond the proper frontier of India ever since that date. As to the "Scientific Frontier," it would be hard for the most ardent advocate of our progressive policy of recent years to show the appropriateness of the term in reference to the drawing of that frontier, as settled with the Amír Abdur Rahman Khan by the Agreements of 1893 and 1895. For so far from being scientific, these settlements, it is now clear, were rather in the first instance a yielding on our part to secure certain imaginary ends of our own; and in the second, a still further yielding, pusillanimous in character and attended by a recklessness as to results so far as the fate of the Kafir race was concerned, in order to appease one whom at the time we were extremely anxious not to offend.

"Why are we Suspected?"

THE agitation in the United Kingdom against the Armenian atrocities has had the effect of provoking a good deal of Continental criticism. Russia and France, and, still more, Germany and Austria have not, so far as their quasi-official Press is concerned, been willing to assume the complete disinterestedness of British motives, and English statesmen—Mr. Goschen, for example—have been addressing themselves to the question, "Why are we suspected?" Madame Novikoff, in the *Daily News*, has undertaken to explain "why there is this astonishing and obstinate refusal to believe" that Englishmen mean what they say. She writes:—

> Yes, indeed, we do not believe what you say, and I will frankly tell you why it is so. Because you hardly ever do what you say, but generally do something else, something startlingly unexpected. It may be not your fault, but your misfortune, that if you compare your words with your deeds, somehow they very seldom agree. It may be due to adverse destinies, but when we compare your promises with your performances, again they are seldom identical. The boy in the fable who cried "Wolf" so often when no wolf was in the sheepfold had all his sheep devoured when the wolf really came, for no one would believe him any more. So it may be that you are quite sincere to-day, but we, who remember yesterday, cannot help feeling sceptical.

Our only comment upon these remarks shall be a "deadly parallel":—

VICEROY'S PROCLAMATION, 1895.	QUEEN'S SPEECH, 1896.
"The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present, and prevent any future, unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and, *as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn.* The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass."	"On the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been successful."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"Tales of Ind."

Mr. T. RAMAKRISHNA, the author of "Tales of Ind and other Poems" (T. Fisher Unwin), is favourably known as the writer of a prose work on village life in South India, and won the approval of no less an authority than the late Lord Tennyson for his poetry. Poems that have been described by so exalted a critic as "interesting and remarkable" do not need commendation from less distinguished sources, and their author would do well to rely upon the late Laureate's testimonial rather than on the oracular verdict of a Madras paper that he has "minted at the forge of Tennyson the sentiments of Oliver Goldsmith, Parnell, and Byron." Lord Tennyson's epithets were doubtless chosen with care. Judged by the standard of absolute attainment, to which all poetry that claims the right to survive has eventually to submit, these "Tales of Ind" would have little claim to notice. They are neither better nor worse than a hundred other volumes of minor poetry, that live their little day and are buried and forgotten. But poems that are without absolute importance may still have considerable importance historically or personally; and so it is with these. As the production in English of a native Hindu, they are highly interesting. They are an experiment by an Oriental in western literature; and though they deal exclusively in Indian themes, they are full of the influence of English poetry, especially of Lord Tennyson. It is, however, not the Tennyson of the "Idylls of the King" who is recalled by these lines, as one or two Indian critics think, but the Tennyson of the earlier English Idylls—of such a poem as "Dora." The stories are, one and all, extremely simple in plot and treatment. The total absence of anything like affectation or straining after effect is one of the most delightful features of the volume. On the other hand, the paucity and poverty of the metaphors are somewhat disappointing: the Occidental who is in search of a happy hunting ground of rich Oriental imagery must turn his attention elsewhere. The English style is remarkably good, and the blank verse, though not always faultless (there is a tendency to weak endings such as "of" and "it" which the author should guard against), is not a hindrance to the narrative. The first story, "Seeta and Rama," has a pathetic interest just now, for it is a story of an Indian famine. Seeta is the daughter of the schoolmaster in an Indian village which is desolated by the scourge. The whole village is broken up, and Seeta, separated from her friends and from her lover Rama, takes refuge in a famine camp. To this camp, after a long interval, comes a youth emaciated by famine. He is tenderly nursed there, and Seeta's heart goes out to him strangely, though she fails to recognise in him her old lover until after his recovery to health. "Prince Désing" is a story of wifely devotion: the prince goes out to battle against a Moslem invader, and is killed, and his wife refuses to survive him. "Rudra" is the tale of a shipwrecked merchant who, like Enoch Arden, returns to his home after many years; he imagines that he has found his wife unfaithful, but is happily saved from avenging himself in his haste on an innocent woman, by finding on a palm-leaf the words, "Think well before you do." "The Royal Huntress" is another idyll of woman's devotion; and the same description applies to "Chandra: a tale of the field of Tellikóta, A.D. 1565," the longest and most ambtious story in the book. Chandra is the wife of a brave warrior Timmaraj, who is killed by the treachery of a rival, Bukka, after several exciting adventures. More interesting, however, than any of Mr. Ramakrishna's original verse is the poem that concludes the volume—a translation of the lullaby sung by the Korathy of the Indian village to soothe the feelings of the maiden who is submitting to the painful operation of tattooing. The first stanza may be quoted here, for its own interest, and also as a specimen of the author's versification.

"Stay, darling, stay—'tis only for an hour,
And you will be the fairest of the fair.
Your lotus eyes can soothe the savage beast,
Your lips are like the newly blossomed rose,
Your teeth—they shine like pearls; but what are they
Before the beauties of my handiwork?"

"India" for 1897.

THE start of a new volume always offers to those who are responsible for a periodical publication a favourable opportunity for the introduction of new features and the improvement of features that are no longer new. We shall hope—*who* is a stranger to hopes at the beginning of a New Year?—to turn the opportunity to account. To how much account remains, of course, to be seen. We may mention, however, that a scheme has for some time past been under consideration by which the general appearance of INDIA might be improved, and certain economies, especially in postage, effected without any substantial reduction in the quantity of matter now printed in the journal. If it should prove that such a scheme is practicable—a scheme, that is, by which there would be much to gain and nothing to lose—it would not improbably be adopted. In that case our readers will not be surprised if INDIA for 1897 makes its appearance in a slightly altered form.

"Those of our countrymen who were beginning to think that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's absence from St. Stephen's enforced a sort of unwelcome idleness on him will see their mistake on turning to the pages of INDIA for the current month. Therein the reader will see our Nestor of Indian Politics hard at work, heckling Lord Wolseley and several members of Lord Welby's Commission on Indian Expenditure, including the worthy President himself, and at the same time drawing out the Civil Service Commissioners.—*Indian Spectator*, October 25.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

HEALTH MISSIONERS FOR RURAL INDIA.

By MISS FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE.

'In a former paper contributed to INDIA I made some suggestions for improving the health of Indian rural villages. My proposal was that a system of simple and popular health lectures should be organised, to show the villagers the need of (*a*) a pure water supply, (*b*) the removal of refuse, and (*c*) the diminution of overcrowding; these lectures being given from village to village by men well versed themselves in the principles of sanitation, and knowing the habits of the people and able to sympathise with them and help them, without offending their prejudices. It was suggested that the village schoolrooms might be utilised for the lectures, which might be made attractive by object-lessons with the magic lantern, showing by the help of microscopic slides the noxious living organisms in foul air and water. But it was pointed out that the lecture would be only the first beginning of the teaching; a lecturer who had made himself acceptable to the people would go round the village and show the people how to dispose of their refuse; he would explain to them the danger of depositing it in their little close courtyards, and how the solid should be separated from liquid excreta. Then he would go with them to examine the water supply, and show them certain simple precautions to be observed: not washing near the supply of drinking water, and not allowing human beings or cattle to foul the river, tank, or well. The Hindu religion enjoins so much purity and cleanliness that I thought the influence of the religious teachers and of the Caste Panchâyats might be usefully appealed to. To show how much may be done for the Indian peasant—who is thought so unpersuadable—by the vigour of sympathy, may I mention an instance of a sanitary officer in India, now alas! dead, who, when he came into office, found the rural people sacrificing with flowers and fruits at the shrines of the Goddess of Smallpox and the Goddess of (whatever they call it) Cholera; and how, long before he left, they came to him, if there had been four or five deaths from cholera,—"Sahib, bestir yourself, don't you see we're all dead?" Another instance of the work of the same man is, how he moved a village in one night which had been decimated by cholera and fever for one hundred years, and which successive Governments, native and British, had in vain attempted to move: in vain, because it was clustered round a temple of great sanctity; and he, by persuading the Panchâyat, moved them to a site of his own choosing; and he came in the morning, and they were all, goods and all, settled in upon the new and safe site. He knew what he wanted to do and how to do it! Is it not the case that we sometimes call people unpersuadable when we do not sufficiently try to look at the matter from their point of view? Do we not sometimes come into fatal collision with prejudices which have in them a grain of truth, because we do not have patience to seek out that truth?

I am painfully aware how difficult, how almost impossible, it is for any one at a great distance to do anything to help forward a movement requiring unremitting labour and supervision on the spot. But it is my privilege to meet in England from time to time Indian friends who are heartily desirous of obtaining for their poorer fellow countrymen the benefits which, through sanitary science, are gradually being extended to the masses here, both in town and country, and which are doing so much to promote their health and happiness; so I never lose an opportunity of urging a practical beginning, however small, for it is wonderful how often in such matters the mustard seed germinates, and roots itself, and at last produces an overshadowing tree. I should like to see such experiments tried in different provinces and under various conditions. As regards the Bombay Presidency I have been so fortunate as to obtain the powerful aid of Mr. B. M. Malabari, who has recently paid his periodical visit to England, and with whom I have had the opportunity of full consultation. And I do not think I shall be betraying confidence if I say that he is turning his special attention to Guzarat and Sind, and will probably make his first attempt by establishing small committees at Rajkot, Ahmedabad, Surat, and Haidarabad in Sind. The watchword is, Small beginnings under favourable circumstances. "Let us begin somehow," he says, "in the name of God, the beginner of good life and good work. Let us cast the seed in the most congenial soil we can find. What pleasure it will be to watch this seed germinate, shoot up the tiny flower, and in time bear the much needed fruit! This is a beautiful process, and the only one that is natural. It will repay us abundantly; the growth we seek will be real and lasting.' The programme he suggests is modest and practical. He proposes to raise a small fund, say Rs. 1,200 or 2,000, for the expenses of the first year. When that has been collected and a local committee is formed, the next step would be to prepare a simple sanitary primer suitable to the local requirements, and to have it translated into the vernacular languages of the district, with a view to its distribution among the rural villages. Then arises the most important part of the work, that of securing Health Missioners for select localities. Mr. Malabari would have them married men, whose wives would accompany them and preach health and cleanliness amongst the village women. In this proposal I would most heartily concur. Indeed from my point of view, to enlist the sympathy

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and gain the approval of the good mother who rules the home, is the keystone of the whole position. If her authority is on our side I feel little fear for the result. Then it is proposed that the Health Missioners should send in monthly reports to the committee, who would publish and circulate the most interesting portions, especially to Local Boards and to sanitary and medical officers. If the movement commended itself to the villagers and to the public generally, the Government might, at the end of the year, be asked to consider the best means of further promoting it.

Such is an outline of the proposals sketched out by Mr. Malabari. It is essentially a scheme of self-help, but it also contemplates recognition by Government. And this seems the right means to attain success: local effort, strengthened and stimulated by the great central authority. Happily there is no doubt of the good-will of Government in this matter of village sanitation; successive Viceroys have shown an anxious desire to deal effectively with this most difficult problem; and a solid foundation for future proceedings is being laid by the excellent "Village Sanitary Inspection Books," which are being introduced for the purpose of collecting and storing precise information regarding the condition of each village. Every sanitarian who reads the Government of India letter of 8th March, 1895 (which is printed at p. 367 for ready reference) will be struck by the thoroughly practical and suggestive character of the various "points" to which attention is drawn. It will be observed that the Government propose to introduce the system of Inspection Books tentatively in selected villages, which will be conveniently grouped, and marked off in the official maps. Such selected villages would be specially suitable for the operation of our voluntary committees, which would be in a position to assist the villagers in accurately compiling the information required by the Government; and doubtless the local officers would gladly include in a group of selected villages any locality which the Committee may choose for the scene of their labours. The Health Missioner in such places would occupy a most useful position—in touch with the villagers on the one hand and with the Sanitary and District Officers on the other. And by gaining the confidence of the people he could act as an interpreter as regards their habits, wishes, and prejudices in such a way as to remove friction and promote useful work.

Many of the "Points" are of an intricate kind, needing much careful local observation. Take for example Point 4, which deals with the character of the soil, and its tendency to retain moisture, or otherwise; and the question is asked whether there is any obstruction to drainage by roads, railways, embankments, or other works. Here many interesting points arise. In fever-stricken villages the soil about the houses may be saturated with noxious matter, or the whole neighbourhood may be so waterlogged, owing to embankments or large tanks in the vicinity, as to produce malarial fever. In this connexion it would be interesting to ascertain from the villagers what, according to their idea, are the causes of local unhealthiness, and what are the medicines and modes of treatment adopted by them in case of illness. Point 8, again, refers to the all-important question of the water-supply, and its proper use by the inhabitants, and here also there is need for constant watchfulness, in order to ascertain whether the people really take trouble to get their drinking water pure, or whether they are content to go on in the old way, taking into their bodies, by means of impure water, the germs of fever and other destructive maladies. It is only by the constant care of the people themselves that a tank or stream, nominally set apart for drinking purposes, can be effectually protected from pollution by liquid refuse, clothes washing, and the intrusion of cattle. And the people will not take this care unless convinced of its vital necessity for themselves and their children. Here therefore instruction and persuasion by friendly and familiar advisers are urgently needed. The vital question of conservancy, including the disposal of house and kitchen refuse, is dealt with in Point 9. This is a matter which depends so much on local conditions and the habits of the people, that too great pains cannot be taken in order to discover in each locality what is the most suitable method of obtaining satisfactory results. In this, as in most of the other matters, it is the peasant woman who, in the rural villages, holds the key either to health or disease.

I have put together these few rough notes in the hope that the leaders of Indian public opinion about to meet in Congress at Calcutta will take up this question, and with their special knowledge and experience will guide our steps in a matter so deeply affecting the welfare of the Indian masses.

THE COMING CONGRESS.

By A. O. HUME, C.B.

The twelfth Indian National Congress is now about to be held, and we might all rejoice that in India, where men's words are writ in water—their works even in sand—this great movement for the political enfranchisement of India's people has so long maintained its vitality. There is, as might have been expected, less open enthusiasm, and perhaps less activity, than there was in the good old days when our adversaries were rampant and reckless, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the very existence of our party depended on all standing shoulder to shoulder, and fighting as one man to uphold the people's rights. The opposition, as an opposition, has disappeared; only here and there its ghost gibbers in some Anglo-Indian newspaper's columns, or, crawling craftily out of sight, seeks to blight, by falsehood and slander, what it no longer dares to attack openly. Success, beyond what any of us who met at Bombay some twelve years ago dared even to hope for, has attended its progress; public opinion here has veered round in its favour; its once blatant opponents are dumb, or, at the most, can only stutter out stereotyped abuse that has, years ago, lost alike force and meaning. Perhaps as a necessary consequence men may have grown somewhat less active in a cause which seems to them to have less need of champions, and with no open opponents near them to struggle against, may have taken to bickering amongst themselves about matters wholly outside the scope of our movement. But even if this be so, as some tell us, our good Congress, the germ of future federated parliaments, is, as all can see, ever sending out its roots deeper and deeper into the nation's heart, becoming more and more truly national, and, full of self-confidence, prepared to meet whatever the future may have in store for it.

All this might, despite temporary discouragements here and there, gladden to its core the heart of every true old Congressman, were there not other aspects of the case to sadden and discourage him. Who that has fought from the outset in this great bloodless battle for justice and freedom, but now, looking round, must deplore the absence of many dear comrades—comrades never more to raise their hands or voices in their country's cause, never more to gladden our hearts with their cheery co-operation? It is not only leaders like Ajoodhia Nath, Telang, Mano Mohan Ghose, and others, but scores and scores of the rank-and-file, no less devoted, no less single-hearted, that we miss and sigh for. And these have gone, so many of our best and truest, and with all their and our efforts, so small a portion of our great task seems yet to have been accomplished! Will our rising generation fill the vacant places with hearts as honest, as true, as unselfish?

Such thoughts might well give us pause amidst our rejoicings on this twelfth anniversary, even were nought else amiss, but as it is all minor sources of anxiety are overshadowed by the cloud now impending over our beloved land, in which we too plainly discern the gloomy spectre of famine frowning down upon us. We are in God's hands, and it may be that this cup will pass away from us, that the coming calamity may tread but lightly on our sacred soil; or, alas! it may be that the terrible scenes which painted misgovernment in all its blackest hues on Southern India, scarce a score of years ago, may in the coming year be reproduced in all their horror in the North.

God grant poor India deliverance from the—to human eyes—all too certainly impending trouble. But whether it be so or no, let every true lover of India read the lesson that will be written in either case in giant letters throughout the land. Whatever Great Britain has done or left undone where India is concerned, she has at least placed largely at her command the triumphs of Western science, and, though it may be largely for selfish purposes, has so endowed her with roads, bridges, railways, canals and other irrigation works, telegraphs and, above all, the most magnificent fleet of merchant steamers that the world can as yet conceive, that, with decent government, there could remain no *chance* even of famine amidst a teeming, frugal and ceaselessly industrious population like that of India. Scarcity there might conceivably be, high prices extending over vast areas we must at lengthy intervals be prepared for, but famine and actual starvation on a large scale would, with existing resources and good government during the last forty years, have become quite impossible.

But instead of a good Government there has been in the most vitally essential point a bad Government—an extravagant Government, a Government that devours the territory of its weaker neighbours and for a pretence makes long prayers.

And when I speak of Government, I do not refer to this man or that, to this party or that—I speak of the system of Government as a whole which has prevailed during the last forty years. Many righteous men and rulers have worked in and under that system, but the system has ever been iniquitous. For that system has its basis in extorting from a loyal, law-abiding, peaceful, industrious people by a set of strangers, barely knowing the language of our people and wholly ignorant of their domestic lives, just as much money as in their infinite ignorance and unmeasured ambition they thought they wanted; allowing to those poor taxpayers no voice however small as to what they should pay, or how they should pay it, or still more as to how what they paid should be spent. It has hence necessarily been a fiscal tyranny of the worst character, and the result has been that, doubtless with plenty of hell's pavement, good intentions, these strangers have multiplied demands on India, till the masses, at any rate, say at *least* one hundred millions of the people, live ever from hand to mouth and have absolutely no reserve to fall back upon in the event of any seasonal calamity.

When I went to India in 1849 there was not a tolerably well-to-do cultivator in any part of Northern India who had not, stored away in a grain pit somewhere about his premises, at least a six months'

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

supply of grain for himself and family. After the Mutiny, in which tens of thousands of villages were burnt (partly by our troops and bands of robbers, but chiefly by the people themselves in local quarrels and contests), there was no great suffering from want of food. The fire over—the enemy passed on—the grain was dug up, and there was food for months, and seed grain for the next harvest. Now, not one per cent. of the cultivators have even a month's supply of grain.

This change, though many causes have contributed to it, has its root in the increase of taxation. Where in old days there was one hole at the bottom of the bucket, to this a dozen smaller holes have now been added—mostly by Government, though some by money lenders, the growth of our hard-and-fast Revenue system.

But (someone says) "the Government *had* to get money; they had to create the railroads and canals and the like, for which you give them credit. At any rate, they have given good value for the money." Yes, no doubt, for the money they thus spent. But they might have spent this much—aye, and twice as much—on like profitable works, and the country would have been none the worse, nay, would have been greatly the better. It is not *this* money that has drained the masses dry. No, it is the countless millions that have been poured into the insatiable military maw here and in India; that have been devoted to keeping up a disproportionately expensive civil service; that the Government has spent to enable it to shake its fist across the frontier at the Russians, and so pretend that it was not afraid, while all the while it was horribly afraid. Reasonably enough, too, for its guilty conscience told it how badly it had treated the people, and, loyal as they are as a whole, it could never believe this, and was, and is, quite as much afraid of them as of the Russians. And so, in a sort of mad despair, it has gone on adding regiment to regiment, battery to battery, fort to fort, and strategical (non-reproductive) railway to strategical railway. If the people had had any voice in their taxation, if they had had any share in the expenditure, all this might long ago have been checked. As it is, it has gone on until nearly half the population are so pauperised that any failure of crops signifies starvation, unless gigantic and ruinous official efforts are put forth to prevent it.

There may be no bad famine this time. God grant it may be so. Or there *may* be. But in either case the fear in which we now stand of this dread calamity, and the calamity itself, if come it must, have their origin simply and solely in the mistaken system on which the Government of India is based, of placing the entire resources of 250 millions of people at the irresponsible disposal of aliens, ignorant alike of the wants, the necessities, the real condition, in a word of the entire inner life, of that great nation, and saturated (though they barely dare to confess it) with the insane delusion that India is to be ruled for the glory of Great Britain and not, first and foremost, for the good of her people.

If, now, there be any Congressman growing apathetic in the work, any becoming wearied in the struggle, wherein so much has to be sacrificed and so little seems as yet to have been won, let him take it to heart. There *may* be no *very* bad time this year; but such a bad time is certain to come, pauperised as India's masses now are, within a very few years, and with it thousands and thousands of cruel deaths and bitter suffering and enfeebled constitutions to millions. And year by year the danger will grow, and the longer the catastrophe is delayed the more terrible it will be when it comes, unless and until we can force the British National conscience to realise the injustice and the iniquity of the present system, and induce that nation to concede to India's people those elementary rights which all but slaves are supposed to possess, and thus put the Indians in the way of helping to direct wisely those great Indian affairs which they, the British people, have no time to attend to, but for the right guidance of which, none the less, they are answerable before man—and God.

And how can this British National conscience be awakened and impressed? Only, to begin with, by the more complete and harmonious co-operation of all our leaders and workers; by the development of a purer and higher patriotism which, allowing a second place only to personal aims and feelings, looks first and foremost to India's good; by an increased and ever increasing zeal and activity, all India's more favoured (because educated) sons bestirring themselves in real earnest, persisting with ever growing fervency in their Congresses and Conferences, in their petitions to Parliament, in their support of the British Committee (which ought to be put in the way of working far more effectively than it now does or can), by themselves coming to England and pouring into the people's ears, here, the truth about their country's wrongs and the unjust and cruel disabilities under which they and their fellow countrymen suffer.

Year by year in India untold millions live and die miserably, solely by reason of a bad system of Government. Assuredly, at the hands of each responsible for this ocean of suffering, God will demand the due penalty. He alone can tell how the blame may be apportioned, but this we know, that amongst those who expiate elsewhere this great national crime will be found, assuredly, those educated sons of India who—understanding the matter, but allowing their souls to be entangled in self, in the cares

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of this world, the struggles for money and office, place and power—neglect to devote an ample share of their time and talents and wealth to the effort to secure for their country and their fellows that improved system of Government to the lack of which we ever owe incalculable suffering, and may, too probably, next year owe the blackest bitterness of famine.

THE LATE MR. MANOMOHAN GHOSE.

BY SIR JOHN B. PHEAR,
Late Chief Justice of Ceylon.

It would be difficult to over-estimate the loss which the cause of progress in India has sustained by the sad death of Mr. Manomohan Ghose. My personal acquaintance with Mr. Ghose commenced so far back as November 1866, just thirty years ago, upon his return to Calcutta from England, where he had resided the previous four or five years, engaged in simultaneously preparing for the Indian Civil Service Examinations and keeping terms at Lincoln's Inn. To his great disappointment at the time he failed of success in the Civil Service competition, but was called to the Bar at Midsummer 1866. How often he must have rejoiced in after life that his early aspirations had been thus thwarted.

The readers of INDIA all know and need hardly here be reminded of the distinguished place which Mr. Ghose eventually secured and has for many years past maintained in the front rank of his profession: and the seeming universality of the cry of mourning, which we are informed has gone up in almost every part of India on the telegraphic announcement of his unexpected death, testifies eloquently to the esteem which he had won for himself in the hearts of his countrymen of all the more advanced nationalities. To understand the peculiar warmth of the regard in which he was so widely held, is not difficult for those who through the opportunities of private friendship have been enabled to recognise in him the sterling qualities of an exceptionally unselfish and noble character. If any man can without qualification deserve the epithets true and good, they pre-eminently belong to him.

His sympathies were ever with the poor and the helpless. And in the course of his extensive practice in the criminal courts of the Mofussil he became painfully impressed with the far too frequent cases, which came under his observation, of injustice and oppression, plainly attributable to ill-judged interference on the part of authority and the faulty working of the inferior courts. He was thus led to devote himself with his accustomed energy to the promotion of the movement for reform of the judicial system in India by the simple and obviously desirable expedient of freeing the minor criminal courts from dependence on the executive, of which so much has lately been heard. The columns of INDIA are not strangers to the somewhat lively controversy to which Mr. Ghose's powerful advocacy of the proposed change has given rise. It was perhaps natural that the proposal should meet with strenuous opposition from those whose care seems to be rather for the sacredness of official authority than the ends for which it exists; but the not very worthy methods by which it has been sought to minimise and invalidate the case that has been built up by Mr. Ghose out of materials largely furnished by his professional experience, if they have done but little else, have served at least to show by their conspicuous failure how complete and impregnable that case is in itself, and how little, fortunately, it now needs the sustaining support of his strong hand. Still sad, indeed, it is that he has not lived to carry out to its final stages the cause which he had so greatly at heart and which he has done so much to advance.

In their habits of daily life Mr. and Mrs. Ghose have conformed entirely to the ways and usages of cultivated European society, and have in all particulars shared the social sentiments of the higher ranks of English people. But this assimilation to the ruling class in India, real as it has been, in no degree weakened Mr. Ghose's patriotic feelings or loosened the ties which bound him to his own people. It was not long before his countrymen discovered that his English education and his association upon equal terms with the members of the governing class, which they at first regarded with dislike and suspicion, was consistent with firm loyalty to national interests and did but fit him the more advantageously for guiding and taking effective part in the popular movement of the day.

It was perhaps attributable to the practical teaching of legal experience that Mr. Ghose was ever ready to treat the case of his opponent with respect, and the great personal influence which he undoubtedly enjoyed both as an advocate and as a politician was in large measure due to the fairness and the absence of exaggeration by which his arguments and statements were on all occasions characterised.

Mr. Ghose's public work was not confined to the provinces of law and politics. His stay in England had enabled him to perceive and appreciate the grave disability under which a people lay for whom education was limited to the stronger sex; and on his return to Bengal he not only took steps, under the guidance of English friends, to secure the best available English education for his betrothed wife, but he joined and zealously co-operated with the small group of younger men who were even then braving social ostracism—notable among them

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Babu Sasipada Banerji with his pioneer work at Baranagar—in their efforts, notwithstanding enormous difficulties, at establishing effective means of education for their adult countrywomen. It was to Mr. Ghose that Miss Ackroyd owed the opportunities which enabled her, aided by a sympathetic committee of both Native and European members, to institute and conduct with marked success at Calcutta the Hindu Mahila Bidyalaya, which was essentially a high class boarding school or college for grown-up native women—distinguished, it may be remarked, from any missionary school in this particular, namely, that while private devotion was encouraged, all interference with the religious faith of the individual students was strictly prohibited. This school, after a separate and successful career of some years, eventually became added as an adult department to the well-known Bethune School for Girls under Government control, and Mr. Ghose, I believe, continued to have a leading voice in its management.

Modest and unpretending of address as Mr. Ghose ever was, and caring little as he did to seek the adventitious aid of the eloquence which fascinates rather then persuades, it was his strong sound sense and the conscientious thoroughness of his work which constituted his especial excellence and caused him to become the popular and trusted leader alike in the courts of justice, in politics and in the cause of education. He has left behind him a name and reputation which are not only dear to those, who have been so fortunate as to know him with the intimacy of private friendship, but which will also surely live in the memory of his countrymen, the subject of their just pride, and an example of citizenship for their emulation.

"As one lamp lights another, nor grows less
So nobleness enkindleth nobleness."

THE APPROACH OF FAMINE.

I.—RETROSPECT: BY AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

Indian famines, their proximate cause, scope, intensity, and consequences, can best be understood by comparison of one with another. For my present purpose, and in such concise manner as only is possible in the space, it will suffice to note the differences that appear in comparing the famine in Orissa in 1866; in Behar, 1874; and that in Madras and the Deccan in 1876-8.

In the first of these instances, though the scarcity was caused by drought in the closing months of 1865, the heaviest mortality was due to lack of prevision by the Bengal authorities, together with the sudden and heavy rainfall of the north-east monsoon in the January following. Sir Cecil Beadon, who then ruled at Calcutta, was a man of a sanguine and hopeful disposition. His Revenue Board, anxious to avoid outlay, disregarded warnings that came from missionaries and other non-officials in Orissa—which warnings were plainly confirmed by starving Oryias crowding into Calcutta—so that between the two, precious time was lost in disputes about supply and demand and other pottering. Sir Cecil Beadon did take a hasty trip down to Cuttack; but the local officials had taken the cue that famine was not desired. Sir Cecil returned to assure his colleagues that there was no occasion for alarm, that local effort would suffice. The rains came, the floods descended, road traffic was impossible, and the province was sealed up to its fate. Some desperate efforts were made at this thirteenth hour to get food into the province by sea, but no appreciable help could be afforded in that way. The mortality due to hunger was officially computed at one million, or 1 in 3¾ of the population of the province in its three divisions of Balassore, Cuttack, and Puri. Sir John Lawrence, anxiously watching from remote Simla, had been obliged to accept reports from the Lieutenant-Governor. When afterwards he found how the facts had been misunderstood, and the truth withheld, he was exceedingly wroth. So was Lord Cranborne, then for the first time Secretary of State for India. A great inquest was held in the form of a Commission of Enquiry of which the late Sir George Campbell, then more of a Punjabi than a Bengal Civilian, was the strongest member. That Commission's full and careful Report presents the first really serious effort to deal with the Indian famine problem as a whole. Though superseded by the more comprehensive enquiries of the Royal Commission on the far larger disaster of 1877-8, that earlier Report laid the foundation of the complete Famine Code which is in full working order at the present crisis. Still before this ultimate result was reached, the problem of famine management had to go through two other stages.

What followed affords a typical illustration of the essential defects in Indian administration that are inevitable, in one form or other, in the absence of that saving balance-wheel—timely publicity and well-informed public opinion. On the first alarm of failure of the rains towards the close of 1873 in Behar, Tirhut, and western Bengal, the authorities concerned, Lord Northbrook in India and the Duke of Argyll as Secretary of State, rose at once to the occasion. His Grace urged that the Indian Government should "not shrink from using every available means, at whatever cost [to India] to prevent, so far as could be done, any loss of the lives of her Majesty's subjects in consequence of the calamity." Lord Northbrook zealously applied this principle; the "supply and demand" doxy was scorned, immense purchases of rice (ill-suited though that grain was for most of the affected districts) were entered into, and—Sir Richard Temple was appointed Famine Delegate, with unlimited powers. With his usual energy he set himself to carry out "master's orders" to the very letter, with little if any regard to local enquiry or precautionary checks. By the time he had begun to scatter bags of rice over Behar it was seen that the scarcity was not nearly so severe as had been feared; but orders had to be carried out. Thus *Vanity Fair*, when, long afterwards, depicting

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Sir Richard in its cartoon, recorded as his chief title to fame, "he invented famines." The lavish expenditure on this occasion appears in the Financial Statement of 1874-5 at 6½ millions sterling. Late in the latter year the present writer was shown in the bonded warehouse at Calcutta vast piles of bags of rice which even Sir Richard had been unable to force on the "suffering" districts.

Thus, in spite of the well intentioned zeal of the responsible authorities, the "Behar famine"—of which we can find no bill of mortality—became a scandal and byword. Then, mainly for lack of the balance-wheel aforesaid, reaction took possession of the financial authorities. The true lessons of Orissa were forgotten; so that when four or five years later the really appalling devastation in Madras and eastern Bombay was coming down on southern India as a dense pall of doom for hapless millions, the gods on far Olympus nursed their scepticism, in spite of ample warnings from the Press and non-official testimony. Thus the whole dire problem had to be worked through afresh. The gods had other business on hand just then. The grand theatrical demonstration at Delhi of the Queen-Empress's Proclamation had to be organised: and the disastrous invasion of Afghanistan was being sedulously worked up to. But the gaunt spectre would brook no denial. When it was seen that the north-east monsoon, due in the early months of 1877, had failed in Madras and the Deccan, hope deserted that immense tract of the Empire—the earth was iron and the sky brass. Meantime the fatal reaction of scepticism aforesaid still lingered in the minds of the authorities; and the financial bogey haunted Sir John Strachey who was then the chief Civilian power in the State. To combat that bogey was Sir John's chief thought; and he hit upon the expedient of sending Sir Richard, not so much to fight the famine as to check the outlay that would be inevitable. This duty the Delegate set himself to perform in southern India with as much zeal and energy as he had exerted four years before in Behar to spend relief funds without stint through imperfectly organised methods. His mission now in 1877-8 was to stint, if possible, and to restrict the organisation already arranged by the Madras district officers. He was assisted by a strong personal staff, including the present Sir Charles Bernard and an officer of Engineers. His first survey of the field was in January 1877, and this is how he did it—

> "With rapidity unexampled, and at too great a speed to secure the object in view, namely, a thorough acquaintance with the real state of the country, Sir Richard and his staff literally raced over the affected districts, caused reductions to be made in gratuitous relief, struck large numbers of people off works, wrote numberless and very long minutes and memoranda, and in three months finished their task. The Delegate's energy was praiseworthy, his intentions admirable; but his performance occasionally otherwise."

It was obvious that he failed to "grasp the real facts of the situation."

It is not needful to follow the painful and dismal history of the 1877-8 famine in southern India. The chief points are Sir Richard Temple's "one pound ration" and the controversies that raged around it; the methods of supply and distribution when all normal trading operations had lapsed; the Viceroy, Lord Lytton's too long delayed visit to the famine field, personally atoned for by his own generous contribution to the relief fund when once opened; the official objections against appealing for public charity until outflanked by the Duke of Buckingham's telegram to the Lord Mayor, and the noble response in the Mansion House Fund, which, together with the Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Colonial contributions, yielded over £700,000. The net results of that famine of 1876-8 were—*mortality* 5,250,000 souls, besides about a million and a quarter in the North-West Provinces and Oudh; *cost* to the Indian Government in direct relief expenditure £11,000,000.

The area affected by the present drought stretches from the northern portion of the Madras presidency, through the eastern part of the Central Provinces, Behar, and Hindustan proper, up to the eastern half of the Punjab. In that area dwell some eighty millions of people, of whom fully one-fourth are suffering more or less from severe privation. Within that area there are some tracts where distress will be mitigated by the blessings of irrigation and water storage. Since 1878 nearly Rx. six millions have been spent from the Famine Insurance Fund on so-called "protective" railways; but barely two millions on irrigation works—the one great material want of India. As already indicated, the one gain to set off against the dismal records of former famines is that the plans and methods for coping with hunger and privation are in as good working order as codified paper regulations can be; and there is no ground for doubting the earnest desire of the present authorities to give full effect to those regulations without any of the fatal stinting which enormously increased the mortality in 1877-8. It only remains for British citizens to consider what is the duty that lies on them in the direction of voluntary contributions. As to the economic side of the problem of Indian famines, the question of all others—why and how it is that so large a proportion of our fellow-subjects in India should be so destitute of reserve resources as to succumb at the first touch of real scarcity—is another story, the depth and significance of which cannot be here described.

II.—By an English Onlooker.

The famine presaged by the scarcity in the North-West Provinces during the past summer, confidently anticipated and carefully prepared for during the last two or three months, is now an accomplished fact. Since September the prices of wheat and other grains have steadily risen throughout the districts visited by the terrible famine of 1877, and the cotton crop has proved deficient, but to what extent still remains to be seen. The latest reports indicate that the distress, at first confined to the Central Provinces and the North-West, has invaded the Konkan, the Deccan, the Karnatic, and Northern Burma. Riots of serious dimensions have occurred at Sholapur, and less important disturbances have arisen in various other districts. Many circumstances contribute to justify the expectation that the period of hardship

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

will be tided over with a comparatively small proportion of the suffering endured in the great famine twenty years ago. In contemplating the elaborate preparations made to combat the impending misfortune, and the energy shown by the officials in charge of the affected districts, it is easy to feel the same glow of sympathy and admiration which inspired Sir Edwin Arnold to write of Lord Northbrook's administration, "how beneficent our government is was shown in those dark days of the famine." But the sole test of a Government is not its behaviour under the stimulus of urgent danger, and the very excellence of its conduct in such crises as the one now confronting India provides a standard by which its deficiencies may be measured in less troubled times. The admirable character of the arrangements provided to anticipate and remedy the occasional failure of crops was shown by the slightness of the dislocation of business produced by the employment during the past summer of some 300,000 people on relief works in the North-West, and by the promptitude and facility with which well-digging, the building of railway embankments, irrigation canals, and other operations of permanent value have now been commenced as relief works. The Indian Government learnt much from the last great year of dearth, though some of the lessons then enforced have of late lost a little of their vividness. The opening of railways and irrigation works, in accordance with the policy urged by Lord Lytton, has proceeded as steadily as financial (which are too often military) exigencies have allowed, and, therefore, while the area liable to famine has decreased, the facility of supplying the affected areas has increased. There are numerous lines of railway and numerous canals, already planned or commenced, which are now being pushed forward. These serve the double purpose of relief works and of active measures for limiting the famine area. American wheat, in spite of the recent rise, can be supplied at nine seers per rupee in Calcutta, and in all probability the immense surplus supplies of the Russian steppes will be tapped for the benefit of India. In this connexion it is a source of no small gratification to note the sympathy and appeals for active assistance in a section of the Russian Press not ordinarily conspicuous for Anglophil tendencies. The rates of carriage for corn from the seaports inland have been reduced, and although there is a natural and reasonable unwillingness to tamper with the ordinary course of trade, the Government is not likely to remain an inactive witness of any attempts to force up prices by that iniquitous contrivance for trading on other people's necessities known as a "corner." What will be the addition to the debt of India as a result of the famine cannot at present be estimated. It is at any rate fortunate that only a third of the railway estimates for the current year have already been expended; the balance may, by the suspension of the big schemes in Burma and Madras, be diverted to the liquidation of the cost of relief works. More important than all is the Viceroy's declaration that the people are displaying both energy and courage in face of their misfortunes, and so greatly alleviating the task of the authorities.

It is pertinent to enquire at the present moment how far the Government of India has carried out the resolutions formed while the memory of the last great famine was still fresh. Attention has been repeatedly called to the neglect of the Famine Fund, on the specious pretext that the building of railways and the limited construction of irrigation works were in themselves insurance against scarcity, and justified the reduction or total abolition of the fund. In the ten years from 1885-6 to 1895-6 the average assignment to Famine Relief was, roughly, one-third of the standard, namely, fifty lakhs. Even with the prospect of famine ahead, the budget of 1896-7 only allotted one crore to this purpose. The difference has, of course, been absorbed by the great spending departments, and more especially by the ever-increasing cost of military services. It is peculiarly irritating to remember that the branch of the public services which feels least the tremendous strain and pressure of such periods as that through which India is now passing, is the one on which falls the largest portion of the responsibility for the increased difficulties due to straitened means. The irony of fate is seen in the circumstance that the country whose treacherous designs are the ostensible cause of military extravagance is the one whose aid is offered to mitigate the evils of a time which might well be expected to relax the bonds of authority and give her the opportunity she is presumed to await. In another direction, too, the policy of the Government is open to criticism. The Bengal Chamber of Commerce has brought against the management of the railways a serious indictment which seems to be well supported by facts. For ten years the export trade in grain has suffered a steady decline in face of the competition with foreign wheat, notably from Argentina. The annual export of wheat from India has fallen from over seven million hundredweights to three and a third millions, with the consequence that the railway receipts on the principal lines also show a grave falling off. For this calamity the Bengal merchants blame the excessive minimum railway rate, and their contention is to some extent borne out by the action of the Government, who have adopted as a primary measure of relief the reduction of railway rates on produce carried from the seaports inland. The importance of the wheat export cannot be overestimated, and nothing should be left undone to maintain it at a high level. Obviously, the measure of a country's capacity to resist the assault of evil times is its surplus in prosperity. India, with its vast population and unreliable rainfall, must always be liable to periods of scarcity, and a charge of something like culpable carelessness may reasonably attach to an administration which, in spite of protest and the warning voice of facts, looks on without making an effort, while the nation's reserve of strength ebbs away. The evil has its root in the unsound financial system which is followed in the building of railways, the dual control, the guarantee, and the whole catalogue of absurdities which were exposed in the March issue of INDIA. In order to minimise the loss involved in the case of certain lines by the payment of a guaranteed rate of interest on an unnecessarily heavy capital outlay, a minimum tariff has been sanctioned so high as, under the circumstances, to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

be partially prohibitive, and so to defeat even the end which it was intended to fulfil.

In his speech before the Legislative Council at Simla on October 15th, the Viceroy made allusion to the "Government of Lord Lytton, who laid it down in the most precise terms that in the increase of railways and canals, but especially of railways, lay the only means open to the Government of meeting the attacks of famine on more favourable conditions." Experience has shown that special insistence on railways, with its corollary in starvation of irrigation projects, is wrong, or at any rate unprofitable. Perhaps if the Viceroy to whose authority appeal is now made had been the representative of a different policy, the railway returns would to-day compare more favourably with the irrigation returns. Down to March 31st, 1894, the total capital expenditure on railways was ninety-four crores. Of this sum little less than a third was expended on the North-Western, in which by far the heaviest item is the cost of the disastrous projects in the Quetta district. During the same period less than thirty crores were spent in irrigation works. In ten years the net loss on the railways was thirteen and a-half crores, the annual deficit showing an increase from one crore in 1884-5 to a crore and a-half in 1893-4. The major irrigation works during the same period show a clear profit, after paying interest on capital debt, of fifty lakhs. But a Government return for the year 1894 shows better results than the Statistical Abstract, in which irrigation and navigation are lumped together to the great disadvantage of the former. The later statistics show that although the canals in Bengal and Bombay are unprofitable, in other provinces they pay from four to seven per cent. on capital. Even the incomplete Chenab canal, which is now being pushed on energetically, is already earning seven per cent. Especially profitable are the minor works constructed out of revenue from time to time, which, with an area of five million acres, earned in 1894 over half as much net revenue as the major works watering thirteen and a-half million acres. In the accounts their value is obscured by the inclusion of the cost of construction under the head of current expenditure and not capital account. On the whole, the net profit to the Government from major irrigation works alone, since their commencement, has been three and a-half crores. A strong case, therefore, is presented for the diversion of some of the millions spent on largely unproductive railways to the more remunerative work of irrigation. The argument sometimes adduced against the latter, namely, that they directly encourage the increase of population, and are therefore not desirable to an unlimited extent in a country already densely populated, proves too much. The same objection might be advanced against any economic proposal whatever, so far as it tends to promote prosperity, even against the construction of railways, or the use of machinery. Even if the objection had validity of a sort, it is put out of court by the very special conditions of the case under discussion. The population has already increased to a point at which any failure of rain is attended with great risk of scarcity, and the people must be provided for by any means within reach. The apprehended increase in their numbers cannot possibly be as rapid as the extension of the means of subsistence in the districts where irrigation is available. And, finally, not even the most ardent upholder of abstract economic theory, nowadays, adheres to the tenets of Malthus. Population will find its own limits none the less surely for the creation of a surplus food supply which, in normal years, will be exported. How to develop such a reserve and to prevent the dissipation of the national resources by redressing the balance of imports and exports, are the questions which any really successful administration must solve.

"HEALTH MISSIONERS FOR RURAL INDIA."

The following is the Government of India letter which is referred to in Miss Florence Nightingale's article at p. 359:—

From J. P. HEWETT, Esq., C.I.E., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India,

To The CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS, The CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BOMBAY, The SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF BENGAL (Municipal Department), The CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH, The CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PUNJAB, The CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE CENTRAL PROVINCES, The CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF BURMA, The CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF ASSAM, The CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF COORG, The RESIDENT AT HAIDARABAD.

Calcutta, the 8th March, 1895.

SIR,—In a Circular Letter No. [1], dated the 28th August, 1893, the Government of India suggested the issue of instructions to all civil and medical officers for enquiries of a practical nature into outbreaks of cholera and other epidemic diseases. Stress was laid upon the necessity for the immediate and thorough investigation on the spot of outbreaks of such diseases, and it was suggested that civil medical officers should be directed to keep ready prepared and to distribute beforehand a printed form of instructions (as prescribed) in the vernacular for the use of all persons whose duty it would be to report the occurrence of cases of cholera.

2. With reference to this subject, and in connexion with the question of improving village conservancy and rural sanitation in India, it has been suggested to the Government of India that district and medical officers would derive much assistance in acquiring a practical knowledge of the local sanitary conditions of their districts if a permanent record containing such information as can be furnished of the sanitary history of each locality were kept up. An attempt has been made to indicate in the questions given in the annexed paper the kind of information which is required, and this information might be embodied in a record to be called the "Village Sanitary Inspection Book" by some literate resident of the village, either the headman, village accountant, or any other intelligent person. It has further been suggested that these questions might be printed on each page of the book both in English and the vernacular of the district, a blank page being inserted after each set of questions for any subsequent remarks which might be made by officers of the district staff, including tahsildars, gazetted officers of the Police and Public Works Department, and officials of the Sanitary and Medical Departments visiting the village on tour. The book should ordinarily be kept in the village as a local record, and sent at the end of every quarter to the Civil Surgeon in order that the information may be abstracted for permanent record in his office.

3. In some Provinces a "Village Note Book" of a similar

[1] 15 Sanitary: Madras, 148; Bombay, 149; Bengal, 150; North-Western Provinces and Oudh, 151; Punjab, 152; Central Provinces, 153; Burma, 154; Assam, 155; Coorg, 156; Haiderabad, 157.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

nature is already maintained for revenue purposes, and the adoption of such a note book for information regarding sanitary matters would in these Provinces be a matter of no difficulty. It appears also to the Governor-General in Council that the suggestion could be easily carried out in other Provinces, and His Excellency in Council therefore desires that the experiment of introducing it should be tried. The Governor-General in Council will leave it to Local Governments and Administrations to make any additions or alterations which may be considered necessary or desirable in the questions to be put.

4. The Governor-General in Council desires that the system above described should be confined for the present to selected villages. It seems to His Excellency in Council essential for the proper working of the scheme that villages and areas selected should be grouped and marked off in the district or Thana maps. They are already so grouped for the purpose of furnishing information regarding cholera, but the existing groups will probably be found to be too large for the present purpose, and it may be desirable to reduce them to 10 or 15 villages at most. The system might at first be introduced in the chief village of each small group and gradually extended so as eventually to embrace all the villages in the group.

5. I am to request that the progress made in the preparation and maintenance of such a village sanitary record in the Madras Presidency, the Bombay Presidency, Bengal, etc., etc., may be duly noticed in the Annual Sanitary Reports.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant, J. P. HEWETT,

Offg. Secretary to the Government of India.

The points to be dwelt on briefly in the "Village Sanitary Inspection Book," should include the following:—

1. Name of village and pargana, with the name of the person by whom information was supplied.
2. Position with regard to main roads, railways, pilgrim routes, etc.
3. Conformation of site and locality.
4. Character of the soil and its tendency to retain moisture or otherwise; state of natural drainage.
   Is there any attempt at artificial drainage?
   Is there any obstruction to drainage by roads, railways, embankments or other works on drainage or by the silting up of rivers or *khals*?
   Spring level of village lands in hot, dry and monsoon months.
   Position of burial grounds and cremation ghats as regards villages and streams.
5. Area, number of houses, their construction, arrangement in groups or streets, sanitary conditions of immediate surroundings of each house or group of houses; site crowding. Are the dwellings generally crowded or otherwise?
6. Population, its principal castes; trades and occupations of the inhabitants.
   Particulars as to migration.
7. Food substances, their source of supply and degree of abundance.
8. Water-supply: principal sources.
   If from wells:—
   How many are there? What are their respective depths and what is the distance between surface of ground and the surface of water in the hot weather? How are they protected from surface impurities? Are they of masonry or not? Are any set aside for particular castes?
   If from tanks:—
   How many are there? What are their respective sizes? Are they protected from fouling by men, as by washing, etc., and by cattle? Are any set apart for the use of particular castes?
   If from rivers or streams:—
   Is the stream polluted from any cause such as impure surface drainage, or trades and manufactures, such as tanning, dyeing, etc., before it reaches the village or during the passage by the village?
   The neighbourhood of burial or burning places to drinking water should be noted.
   Are the wells or tanks set apart for drinking purposes periodically cleaned. If so at what intervals? The date on which each cleaning actually takes place should be noted.
9. Is any place, or are any places, set aside for answering the calls of nature?
   If so, what is the position of such a place or places with regard to:
   The prevailing winds, natural drainage of the country the wells and tanks and the dwellings of the inhabitants? Is the site systematically cultivated? Is any system of conservancy carried out? If so describe it. How is house refuse disposed of?
10. Are there many cattle or domestic animals kept in the village? How are they stalled or penned? Is manure stored in the village in any quantity? If stored outside the village, where is it kept? Is any place set apart for the slaughter of animals by butchers, or for chamars to skin or cut up animals; and, if so, at what distance from the village?
    Notes of epidemics among cattle should be recorded.
11. Are any religious fairs (melas) held in the village? If so, are they largely attended and by what classes of people? When are the market days?
    What is the average attendance at religious fairs and markets?
12. Are marriage processions frequent? Are they largely attended?
13. The births and deaths should be noted.
    How are the dead disposed of? Is cremation thoroughly carried out? What becomes of the ashes? Are dead Mussulmans buried in a special cemetery? Are any buried in compounds or within municipal or village limits? How are the bodies of dead children disposed of? How are persons dead of smallpox and cholera disposed of? Is vaccination popular among the inhabitants?
    Notes of epidemics among human beings should be recorded.
14. Meteorological phenomena, such as exceptional rainfall, floods or unusual change of temperature should be described.
15. Other unusual phenomena, such as floods, drought, scarcity or famine, should also be noted.

ROBERT BROWNING'S POEMS.[1]

Messrs. Smith, Elder and Co. have deserved well of the world in giving to it, in a compact form, and at a moderate price, a complete edition of Mr. Browning's plays and poems from Pauline (1833) to Asolando (1889). To say that the editor of these beautiful volumes is Mr. Augustine Birrell is to add a sure guarantee that the editor's duties have been discharged with taste, discretion, erudition, and humour withal. Mr. Birrell explains that his edition makes no pretence to be critical. Obscure and difficult passages are left to be explained by a careful study of the context; beauties or defects of composition are not discussed; corrupt passages are not emended—for no passages are corrupt. "All that has been done is to prefix (within square brackets) to some of the plays and poems a few lines explanatory of the characters and events depicted and described, and to explain in the margin of the volumes the meaning of such words as might, if left unexplained, momentarily arrest the understanding of the reader." Each volume contains as frontispiece a portrait of the poet—one dated 1835, the other 1881. An excellent addition to the second volume is a chronological list of the poems and plays. Type, printing, paper, and binding are all admirable. The effect of this edition will no doubt be greatly to extend the circle of Mr. Browning's regular readers.

[1] "Poetical Works of Robert Browning." With Portraits. In two volumes. (London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1896.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1896.

THE EXPECTED FAMINE.

THE news which the telegraph has been bringing from India during the past seven or eight weeks has steadily become more and more grave. Early in October we learned that widespread scarcity was probable in the Punjab and certain districts of the North-West Provinces, that the prices of food and grains had risen enormously, and that grain riots had occurred and were likely to be renewed on a larger scale. It was pointed out that distress was for the moment limited to well-defined localities, but that if no rain fell before November an enormous area would probably be affected by the failure of the cold weather and spring crops. In the middle of October tolerably full reports were received of a meeting of the Legislative Council at which the Viceroy and Mr. Woodburn, the member in charge of the Revenue and Agricultural Department, frankly discussed the prospect of "severe scarcity" over the large area that was so grievously stricken eighteen years ago. Two days later we read that rain was "now improbable," and that famine—Lord Elgin had used the dreaded word—was inevitable unless sufficient rain fell within the affected area. Since then there has been no really reassuring news, but official telegrams, while they have defined the threatened districts and recorded the absence of rain, have also announced the opening of test relief works, and the various other measures which have been, or are being, taken by the authorities to mitigate the consequences of a calamity recognised as imminent. Need it be said that this grave news has attracted attention and excited sympathy throughout the United Kingdom? The danger of famine, like the re-imposition of the cotton duties, or a trans-frontier campaign, dispels for a moment the characteristic apathy of the British public towards India. Newspapers which on ninety-nine days out of every hundred complacently ignore the existence of British India, suddenly become alive to the opportunity, the concise cyclopædia is taken from its shelf, and the index to the report of the Famine Commission is hastily scanned. The advantage of these occasional researches is not to be denied. But while nothing could be more admirable than the sympathy which is invariably expressed, it must be admitted that the writers do not for the most part probe very far below the surface. The usual observations may be summarised in a few sentences. They are (i) that the Government of India and all British residents in India are seen at their best in coping with famine; (ii) that everything that can be done will be done; and (iii) that the outlook is less grave than it was in the 'seventies because while irrigation works will now aid the production, and railways and roads the distribution, of food, the stricken areas will also be able to draw upon hitherto unknown sources of external supply.

There is no need to dwell upon these excellent, if somewhat threadbare, remarks. It is more important to ask whether, after all, they are quite the last word on the subject. Nobody who knows anything of Indian opinion can think that they are. Let us acknowledge at once the faultless temper of the speech delivered by the Viceroy on October 15th. "If," he said, "I may speak from my own feeling "in the matter, there is not a man who would not "strain his utmost to prevent the loss of a single "life." We take these words as meaning that life is to be saved at any cost, and that nobody is to be allowed to starve. That is a policy which deserves, as it will receive, the approval and support of every humane man and woman. It is the policy which was followed in Behar in 1874. But we must not disguise from ourselves the fact that another system was unfortunately adopted a few years later in Madras, and that there was a lamentable loss of life—a loss much greater, in all probability, than the authoritative records were able to state. The policy of 1874, if it is pursued, will undoubtedly cost a large sum. Besides the actual outlay for relief, there

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

must be—indeed, there have already been—suspensions and remissions of land revenue on a large scale. In dealing with an Indian famine, as every competent observer admits, political economy has to be banished to Saturn. There must be no scruple about interfering with private enterprise, and no idea that a demand is sure to create a supply. The Government must take the business into its own hands. There is one thing which it ought not to do—and that is to prohibit the export of grain. So long ago as October 14th it was stated that appeals were being made to the Government to take this course. But to such appeals the Government, if it is well advised, will turn a deaf ear. We have, however, a definite suggestion to offer, which Lord Elgin's emphatic and sympathetic words encourage us to offer with the greater confidence. In the Budget for 1894, as will be seen from another page, the regular grant to the Famine Insurance Fund was, in spite of the pledges given when the Fund was inaugurated, wholly suspended for the time being. In the same Budget, by a curious and unpleasant coincidence, a large sum was set apart as "exchange compensation allowance" for European officials in the Government of India. Now, as the stress of the expected famine will, under existing circumstances, fall upon the Indians themselves, and will not touch the higher officials, it is, we think, a reasonable suggestion that the grant of exchange compensation should, at least temporarily, be stopped. If this suggestion be acted upon, the Government will have more money to devote to saving life, and the official classes in India, without exactly "straining their utmost," will bear a share of the burden. Even so, the burden imposed by the famine upon the taxpayers will be very grievous, and India will have abundant cause to regret the policy which diverted the Famine Insurance Fund to scientific frontiers and Chitral expeditions.

Lord George Hamilton's speech, which is reported elsewhere, and which seems to have attracted an audience nearly as large as an Indian Budget audience in the House of Commons, contained an unusual number of small inaccuracies. But it described clearly enough the existing organisation for dealing with famine, and it paid a compliment to Lord Elgin for which the appropriator of Chitral will no doubt be suitably grateful. What neither Lord George Hamilton nor Lord Elgin has explained is how it comes about that so many millions of British subjects in India are at this time of day so readily liable to the dangers of scarcity. Mr. A. O. Hume, in an article which we print elsewhere, does not hesitate to lay some portion, at any rate, of the responsibility at the door of the system, as distinguished from the individual administrators, of government in India. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji holds the same opinion, and fortifies it with statistics showing, in the words of Lord Salisbury, how much of the revenue is annually exported from India without a direct equivalent. The contention is not new. It was urged by Mr. John Bright forty years ago in these words:—

> "I must say that it is my belief that if a country be found possessing a most fertile soil, and capable of bearing every variety of production, and that notwithstanding, the people are in a state of extreme destitution and suffering, the chances are there is some fundamental error in the government of that country."

Upon this grave indictment we may, at this particular moment, forbear to dwell. But amid all the well-deserved eulogies of the Famine Code, it may not be amiss to bear in mind Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's observations—that it is the extreme poverty of the mass of the Indian people which constitutes the danger of famine; that this poverty exists side by side with a particular system of government; and that the Famine Insurance Fund, even when it is not disbursed upon alien projects, simply means that the poor are taxed to prevent starvation. As Mr. Naoroji says:—

> "I appeal to any fair-minded Briton; suppose that the French became the rulers of this country, occupied every office of benefit, drove away your Gladstones and your Salisburys into oblivion and poverty, allowed you no voice in controlling expenditure, took away enormous sums of money in the name of Services, and further, by means of these same funds introduced as Capital, took away other enormous sums as profits—how long would it take to impoverish England?"

That is a question which will remain when the present danger has been successfully met. Meantime there can be nothing but praise for the energy and devotion of the Government in India in dealing with the immediate crisis.

WANTED: CHECKS ON EXPENDITURE.

LORD WELBY and his colleagues, who are enquiring into the administration and management of Indian expenditure, have found it convenient to divide their subject-matter into three main sections. These they name respectively (i) financial machinery of the Government of India; (ii) progress of expenditure; and (iii) apportionment of expenditure in which both Great Britain (*sic*) and India are interested. The evidence heard at the thirty sittings which have so far been taken extends over all these sections. But we have reason to believe that it most nearly approaches completeness in the first—that is, in the section relating to financial machinery. The proclamation appointing the Royal Commission expressly stated that any five or more of the Commissioners had "liberty to report" the proceedings "from time to time" if they should judge it expedient so to do.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

If this virtual invitation to issue *interim* reports had been accepted, it is pretty certain that the first report would have dealt with financial machinery. It may be of interest, therefore, to look into the evidence which deals with this subject, and to see how far, if at all, it tends to give support to the demands put forward by educated opinion in India. Two preliminary remarks, however, need to be made. In the first place, it is to be noted that the evidence comes, not from Indians, but from Englishmen, and not merely from Englishmen, but from Englishmen who hold, or have held, high office under the British Government in India. To look for help from them is much as if, in this country, one should ask the permanent officials at the Foreign Office or the War Office for their candid opinion about popular aspirations, and about suggestions for the improvement of their own departmental methods. Without labouring the point, we may at least observe that any admissions made in such quarters would possess something more than the ordinary significance of the terms in which they were couched. In the second place it must be remembered that the question of machinery is not the question with which, in the department of finance, educated opinion in India is chiefly concerned. In other words, it is not denied that the Government of India is a tolerably efficient book-keeper. Much, therefore, of the evidence of witnesses like Sir Henry Waterfield, Mr. Stephen Jacob, and Sir Edwin Collen amounts to an explanation, by way of preface, of methods which, though they may be open to criticism in detail, raise no large issues of principle.

On the other hand, there undoubtedly is one very important question raised in this section—the question, namely, of financial control. Here is a Government which raises a revenue of something like a thousand millions of rupees annually. What is the guarantee that this revenue is wisely and economically expended? Lord Welby (Q. 2909) presented one aspect of this question very clearly:—

"Sir David Barbour made a criticism, which I think all officers connected with financial departments must allow as a criticism of general application, namely, that sufficient attention is not given by the departments in India to the financial question. They hardly appreciate the gravity of it, and do not forecast what the financial effect of the measures on which they are bent may be. That, of course, is a defect common to all Governments. The heads of different departments very seldom take a general view of the effect of their administration. They are anxious to carry out measures which they think important."

Precisely; and unless some check is placed upon their competitive enthusiasm they will spend more money than the taxpayer can afford, and may also spend it upon objects which he does not desire. "That," Lord Welby says, "is a defect common to "all governments." No doubt. But the question in each case is, how is the defect remedied, and how is the taxpayer protected? Or, is there to be no remedy? Is the taxpayer to be content if, while somebody else calls the tune, he is permitted to pay the piper? Educated Indians, who have read history, and take an interest in politics, do not think so. Witness, for example, this passage from Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea's Presidential address at the last session of the Indian National Congress:—

"Englishmen are our teachers. At their feet we have learnt those constitutional principles which have moulded the governments of the civilised world, and which we hope will one day be incorporated in the government of this country. If there is one thing more than another which this constitutional history impresses upon the mind of the reader, it is this: the jealous solicitude which the English people show at every stage of their history to ensure to their representatives, and to them alone, the full and absolute control over the finances of the country."

The check upon the zeal of spending departments in the United Kingdom is, in Lord Welby's phrase, "anticipation of the action of Parliament"—that is, of the representatives of the taxpayers. Needless to say, there is in India no check of this kind. Under the provisions of the Indian Councils Act, indeed, the Legislative Councils do now contain a few non-official members who, to some extent, represent public, as distinguished from departmental, opinion. But they have no votes. They may discuss the Budget. But they cannot divide upon it, nor move amendments to it. They can only make speeches, and when they make them it is too late for them to take effect. Similarly, by the 53rd section of the Act for the Better Government of India (1858), the Secretary of State is required to lay the India accounts and estimates before Parliament. But there is no effective discussion because there is no effective resolution. The House of Commons is merely invited to say that the closed accounts record the totals which they do in fact record.

Now, it is gratifying to note that neither Sir Auckland Colvin, who was Finance Minister from 1883 to 1887, nor Sir David Barbour, who was Finance Minister from 1888 to 1893, is satisfied with this state of affairs. Sir David Barbour says, for example (Q. 1,833):—

"I certainly think that something is very desirable which would ensure greater attention being paid to financial considerations in connexion with the Government of India."

Again (Q. 1,930):

"I think it would be better for India, better all round, if more attention were given to the financial question, and if we went more slowly in periods of great apparent financial prosperity."

Sir Auckland Colvin (Q. 2,909) agrees with Sir David Barbour in this opinion. The Finance Minister, he says (Q. 2,910) "does not get sufficient support." Examining Sir A. Colvin, Lord Welby said:—

"The point of Sir David Barbour's criticism, I think,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

might be put thus: that in a country like India where deficits are more dangerous than they would be here, where new taxation is more difficult than it would be here, the Government as a whole does not give sufficient attention to what may be the financial results of measures which it adopts."

Whereupon Sir Auckland Colvin remarked :—

"I agree entirely to that; and I would add to that, that in a country where the taxpayer is an alien, and is not able to make his voice directly heard, the need of giving close attention to economy in administration is greater than it would otherwise be."

It would be difficult to over-estimate the importance of this evidence. Those who, where Indian administration is concerned, venture to doubt whether all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds are commonly denounced as fanatical partisans and ignorant amateurs. Is Sir Auckland Colvin a fanatical partisan? Is Sir David Barbour an ignorant amateur? These experts who, taken together, filled the office of Finance Minister during the ten years 1883-1893, agree in the opinion that the Government of India does not give sufficient attention to financial considerations. It goes without saying that Lord Welby and his colleagues cannot ignore this important declaration. They are bound, on the contrary, to address themselves to the task of discovering a remedy. Neither Sir A. Colvin nor Sir D. Barbour is prepared off-hand to put forward a definite scheme to this end. But they make more than one valuable suggestion which we set out on another page. There has never been any doubt in the minds of educated Indians as to the broad lines upon which financial reform must run. The discussion upon the Budget, both in India and in Parliament, needs to be converted from a farce into a reality.

THE GREEK LYRIC POETS.[1]

"It happened to the people of Posidonia," says Aristoxenus in "Athenaeus," "who were sometime "Greeks, that they were utterly barbarised, and "became Tyrrhenians or Romans, so that they "changed their language and the rest of their "customs; but they even now still observe one of the "Hellenic feasts, in which, coming together, they "call to memory their old names and customs, and "having bewailed them to one another and wept "their fill of tears, they separate." Would it not be well, even in these latter days, to institute some such annual custom for the many amongst us "who "were sometime Greeks" and read Homer and Sophocles in their youth, but who have been "utterly "barbarised" by the cares of this life since they bade farewell to school or university? To such a gathering might come not only those who loved the classics in boyhood, for they perhaps form but a small fraction of the learners; but some who like Robert Herrick, in Stevenson's "Ebb-Tide," have found strange and unexpected consolation in a tattered classic, when they have turned to it in later life; and perchance, in softer mood, even the old Rugbeian who boasted the other day that he could only remember of his stock of classics one line of Greek —a line of Homer that he had written out six hundred times at the stern bidding of the new Archbishop of Canterbury.

But there is, after all, a more excellent way than the institution of a new Congress for the display of ineffectual remorse. It is possible for anyone who still retains a modicum of the Greek he learnt at school, to take Mr. Brooks's charming little volume and follow the selections from the Greek lyric poets with the aid of the accurate and literal rendering printed at the foot of each extract. He will not repent his trouble. He will gain an introduction to a new world of poetry, for it is only a very exceptional boy who reads Greek lyrics at school. And, in all probability, unless he has completely lost the power of enjoying poetry, he will be astonished to find how much more vitally interesting Greek poetry is when he comes back to it in mature life, than it seemed to be in his school days. For youth, as Mr. Pater told us in "Gaston "de Latour," even studious youth, is "of listless "humour among books that certainly stirred the "past," and only "makes a docile act of faith "regarding the witchery of Virgil." Here and there, no doubt, a boy or girl feels the full charm of a magical line or a romantic story, even in a dead language. But most of us need more experience of life before we can either appreciate the abiding interest of the poet's themes, or reconstruct for ourselves in any measure the vanished past, with its likeness to or differences from the present.

In the case of the Greek lyric poets the amount of "reconstruction" to be done is, of course, specially large; for they only survive to us in fragments. To one class of these remains, those whose authorship is quite uncertain, editors have given the pathetic name of Fragmenta Adespota, "unowned fragments." The day may yet come for the fragments to be restored to their context, and for the forgotten author to receive a late immortality. The discovery of the famous Aristotelian papyrus and of part of the lost "Antiope" of Euripides makes the possibility of recovering some of the vanished wealth of Greek lyric poetry something better than an idle dream. How great the gain would be to literature, if that possibility were to be realised, it is difficult to estimate. The ancients spoke of Sappho in the same

[1] "Greek Lyric Poets." Selected and translated by Francis Brooks, M.A., lecturer in classics at University College, Bristol. London: David Nutt.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

breath with Homer; Horace made the freest use of Alcaeus; and where a line or two of the original survive, enabling us to make the comparison, we are bound to confess the superiority of the Greek in power and passion, if not in perfection of form. But if we leave on one side the Epinician Odes of Pindar—quite possibly not his best work, as the discovery of his other poems may some day prove to a delighted generation of scholars—almost the whole of this wonderful poetry is lost to us. What remains has been chiefly preserved in the pages of old critics and grammarians, who quoted passages, not for their literary beauty, but because they illustrated a rule of syntax, a metrical canon, or some custom or legend. Unless, therefore, we are disposed to wait on the highly uncertain chance of the discovery of a papyrus of Sappho, we must be content to take advantage of the patient labours of Bergk and his predecessors, who, in Mr. J. A. Symonds's expressive phrase, have "sorted out from heaps of shot rubbish" these "fragments of extinguished stars." After all, the stars are not really extinguished; only fragments of them are left, it is true, but they are fragments that burn and shine with imperishable lustre.

Several kinds of reconstruction are open to the interested and intelligent reader. He may bestir his fancy—as Mr. Frederick Tennyson tells us, in the preface to his "Isles of Greece," he was moved to do by "a weird little volume" containing these same "delicious fragments"—to imagine what the "full-"orbed perfect compositions" must have been. Or, if that be a task which only a poet should attempt, he may at least amuse himself by piecing together the character of an individual poet out of the lines that survive to witness for or against him. The greed of Alcman, with his unaffected delight in the season of the year "when the world is in bloom and "one cannot satisfy desire in eating;" the cynical roguery of Timocreon, convicted of taking a bribe from the Persians and comforting himself with the reflection that other foxes, too, have lost their tails; the pessimism of Bacchylides, crying out that "not "to be born is best for mortals," and finding his solace in "the sweet tyranny of riotous cups;" the passion of "violet-weaving, pure, soft-smiling" Sappho; the aristocratic temper of Alcaeus, the hater of "low-born Pittacus;" the nobler strain in Simonides, who has seen splendid devotion, and sung of it worthily, and who yet looks in pity rather than in anger on the baseness to which the average man will yield under pressure of necessity—how vivid an appeal is made to us by the intense humanity of all these characteristics, good and bad alike! Or, once more, our imaginary student may try to reconstruct the Greek world in which these poets lived, that early "lyric age," as it has been called, of which we seem to know so much less than of the Homeric age that preceded or of the Attic age that followed. We catch many glimpses of it in Herodotus, who often seems rather to belong to it than to the Attic age in which he wrote. But we have nothing more than glimpses, and it is allowed to us to draw our own inferences from the tone of these fragments. "Young light-hearted masters of the wave," Mr. Matthew Arnold called the early Hellenes in a felicitous line; and there is evidence enough in these poems of light-heartedness, of love of the dance and wine and song. But there is evidence also of that melancholy which often alternates with light-heartedness, and which is almost equally characteristic of the Hellenes, from the Homeric Achilles downwards. Uglier characteristics, too, are apparent; the wars and seditions of the time, its greed and cruelty, its sudden reversals of fortune. Professor Mahaffy seems to think that their hospitality was the one redeeming feature of the Greeks of this period; but we ought to remember that, if they were cruel, they were one degree less cruel than their barbarian neighbours. "The barbarian muti-"lates, impales, crucifies," as Professor Freeman once said, "the Greek simply slays." Lastly, if we do not wish to reconstruct at all (though we shall miss much if we refuse to exercise our imagination thus) there is still left to us the universal interest of poetical truth and beauty. The poet is neither of nor for one age, but of and for all time. Lines like these of Simonides have an abiding value and charm altogether independent of the particular occasion they celebrate:

> "Of those that died in Thermopylae glorious is the fortune and fair the doom; their grave is an altar; for mourning they have remembrance, for lamentation praise. And such a winding-sheet neither decay nor all-conquering time shall make dim."

A word should be said of the popular songs, which to some readers will be the most interesting portion of the volume. Here, of course, is the famous "Linus Song," and the charming "Swallow Song," in which Greek children greeted the approach of spring. Even at this day a "Swallow Song," not unlike the old one, is sung, whether or no the custom has descended through all the centuries. Here, too, is the "Mill Song," with its gibe at Pittacus, the tyrant who ground Mitylene; and readers of Arnold Passow's collection will remember that mill songs still exist in Greece, and that the grinding of the millstone is still associated with oppression. There are also tantalising glimpses at children's games. One—"I will hunt a brazen fly," with the response, "You will hunt but you will not catch"—was a sort of blind man's buff. Another, evidently a "ring" game, asks in a simple haunting melody, "Where are my roses, where are my violets, "where is my pretty parsley?" and receives the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

answer, "Here are the roses, here are the violets, "here is the pretty parsley." In a third, described by Pollux, a girl, called the Tortoise, sat in the centre of a ring of girls, who ran round her asking questions. This was their dialogue. (A prose version necessarily loses so much of the charm, that for once we desert Mr. Brooks in favour of a metrical rendering):—

"Tortoise, Tortoise, what are you doing?
Weaving wool from fleeces of Miletus.
Tortoise, Tortoise, how did your son die?
From white horses he leapt into ocean."

The last line has puzzled the scholars. Some see in the "white horses" a poetical name for the breakers. De Fouquière finds in this song "the wail of the "bereaved mothers dwelling on the coasts of Asia "Minor whose sons perished in the defeat at Sala-"mis"! After such sort is the wisdom of commentators.

We have been told lately that Mr. William Morris worked at his verse translation of the Odyssey with a prose version "frankly" open before him. Now that at last the fragments of the Greek lyric poets have been made accessible in English, it only remains for a poet "frankly" to exploit Mr. Brooks.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

What, we wonder, is the meaning of the numerous paragraphs and articles which are cropping up in all sorts of odd quarters about Tibet? One day it is Captain Wellby's expedition—the next it is Tibetan trade. Are we to infer that Tibet is to be the scene of the "forward" frontier party's next operations? At any rate, it may be well to keep an eye upon the straws which proverbially show the direction of the wind.

We take the following extract from Lord Salisbury's speech at the Guildhall Banquet (November 9th):—

"With respect to Russia, I should not have ventured to make any definite observations but for the extraordinary statements which have recently appeared in Germany on apparently the voucher of, I may say without fear, the greatest statesman that the latter part of this century has produced. I hesitate to make any observation upon statements coming from such a source, but I do reserve the right to demur absolutely to the assumption on which he appears to go—that there is a permanent, necessary antagonism between Russia and Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) I know of no such antagonism. I know of no cause that would give rise to it, and the interests of the two countries do not seem to me likely to cross in any important matter so as to cause such a divergence as he appears to assume. (Cheers.) Speaking from the Foreign Office point of view, I regret to say that we have discussions with all Powers, but the discussions we have with Russia are by no means the most voluminous—I should almost say that they are the most concise of all in which we are engaged. (Cheers.) It is, therefore, I think, a superstition of an antiquated diplomacy that there is any necessary antagonism between Russia and Great Britain. (Hear, hear.)"

The passage may be commended to the careful attention of the "forward" frontier school.

Later, proposing the health of the Lord Mayor, Mr. Alderman Faudel-Phillips, Lord Salisbury said:—

"I rise to propose a grateful toast of those who have dined well to the hosts who have entertained them. I rise to propose the health of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs who are our hosts. But in this case I am permitted to add a special reason why I am glad to have the honour of proposing the health of the Lord Mayor. In his case, as you are aware, the dignity is hereditary. (Cheers.) Thirty years ago, when I first held Cabinet office and was Secretary of State for India, I was confronted with the terrible problem of an Indian famine. The difficulties, of course, in the main lay with those who were in India. But a considerable portion fell upon us at home; and then I found the wisest counsellor, and the most careful and zealous assistant, in the father of my right hon. friend the Lord Mayor, who was then Lord Mayor of London. (Cheers.) I shall never forget the kindness, counsel, and assistance which he gave me, when, somewhat young and somewhat unexpectedly, I was confronted with that terrible difficulty. And it is a matter of no small pleasure to me that I am here to propose the health of his distinguished son, who, I have no doubt, will adorn, as his father did, the high office which he has been called upon to fill. (Cheers.)"

Lord George Hamilton, referring at Acton on November 11th to Lord Salisbury's speech, said:—

"The speech of Lord Salisbury he regarded, speaking now, not as a Minister, but as a private citizen, as eminently satisfactory. He listened to no part of it with greater assent than the statement that there was no irreconcilable quarrel between this country and Russia. In his view Russia was one of the countries between which and England there was no national antipathy, no industrial rivalry, and no colonial competition."

These remarks of Lord Salisbury's and Lord George Hamilton's, read in conjunction with the news that Russian wheat is being imported into the Indian districts which are now threatened with famine, are distinctly interesting.

In contrast with Lord Salisbury's and Lord George Hamilton's remarks, we may cite the following characteristic Note from the *St. James's Gazette* of November 20th:—

"It may seem ungracious to comment suspiciously on the Russian subscription for the relief of the famine in India. But the opening of a fund in St. Petersburg, under the auspices of the Ministry of Finance, contrasts rather remarkably with the way in which the Lord Mayor hangs back in London. The 'nasty' comment of the Berlin Press to the effect that "Great Britain must seem to the natives of India to be impotent and to be soliciting aid from Russia," is one which may have a substratum of truth. The moral effect of the starting of a Russian Fund, while there is no English Fund, can hardly help being bad; and if things go so far as the distribution of the money by Russian agents the effect will be even worse. We do not quite understand the attitude of the Indian Government and the India Office in this matter. So far as Russia is concerned, humanity apart, this attention to India combines a moral demonstration with the acquisition of a fine new market for Russian grain. But in the peculiar relations in which India stands to the British and the Russian Empires, it is hardly necessary to accentuate, as a matter of charity, what in fact should be merely a good piece of business."

The *St. James's* on the subject of "charity" is distinctly good.

Lord Reay has accepted the presidency of the East India Association.

Sir Charles Elliott has not yet become a member of the India Council, but he has been co-opted to the London School Board. "The Board have," in the opinion of a witty observer, "secured the services of a man quite as competent as Sir Richard Temple, who threatens to become the most voluminous author of the age, now that he is released from Parliament,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and quite as indefatigably laborious." Sir Charles Elliott is chiefly known as the enemy of trial by jury and the champion of trial by executive officers. If he is consistent, he will now propose that school attendance officers under the London School Board shall decide the cases upon which they report.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. William Mackworth Young, C.S.I., of the Indian Civil Service, as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab in succession to Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick, whose tenure of office expires in March next.

Mr. Mackworth Young, who is thus nominated Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, has been in the Indian Civil Service for thirty-three years. He was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge. He is thoroughly familiar with the Punjab, for there he held his first appointment as an Assistant Commissioner. From having been at one time Secretary to the Financial Commissioner, he came to be the Financial Commissioner himself; and having once been Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, he has now come to be the Lieutenant Governor nominate. In the meantime he has held high office. He has been Secretary to the Government of India in the Home Department, and he has been Chief Commissioner of Coorg. He presided over the Indian Hemp Drugs Commission. His salary as Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab will be 100,000 rupees per annum—a sum that at the nominal value of the rupee would be £10,000. At its present exchange value in England it would be about £6,000—and not a bad "living wage" either, in these days of impending famine.

Professor Murison, who is well known to readers of INDIA, is to be cordially congratulated upon having come within fifteen votes of defeating the Marquis of Huntly in the contest for the Lord Rectorship of the University of Aberdeen. That is the sort of result which suggests a slightly different result next time.

Commenting on the election, the *Daily News* wrote :—

"This is the third in the series of Rectorial contests, which are peculiar to Scotland, and which afford much pleasurable excitement to the undergraduate population of that ancient kingdom. As usual, the Liberals have in all three cases got the worst of it. Mr. Chamberlain beat Mr. Birrell at Glasgow, Lord Balfour beat Mr. Haldane at Edinburgh, and now Professor Murison has been defeated at Aberdeen. What may be Lord Huntly's qualifications for academic office we must admit that we are unable even to conjecture. Mr. Murison is a man of ability and distinction, an ornament of University College, London, who should, in the opinion of many Aberdonians, have succeeded Mr. Hunter as member for North Aberdeen. He may hope to be Lord Rector next year."

The Aberdeen system of electing a Lord Rector is a curiosity of voting. It is a relic of the mediæval system of Paris—long since abandoned by the Parisians themselves, and greatly modified by the other Scotch universities. For the purposes of voting all the undergraduates are divided into four Nations, this, of course, being a meaningless remnant of the mediæval system by which the students of different nationalities elected as chairman a Rector to defend their rights against civic interference. There are four Nations at Aberdeen. Mar, Buchan, and Moray represent students born north of the Grampians. Angus stands for the rest of the world! On the voting day each Nation is locked up in a room by itself. But the students at Aberdeen do not give a direct vote for the Rectorial candidates. They vote for a student who represents them, called the Procurator. After the recording of the votes (which are given orally) the "Procurators" meet in another room, and the successful candidate is he who has a majority of Nations. If the Nations are equally divided the winner is he who has the numerical majority of votes.

A prominent London Unitarian Minister, the Rev. James Harwood, of Effra Road Church, Brixton, is travelling to India in the "Bombay" as the representative of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. Mr. Harwood will, we understand, journey from Bombay to the North-West, and hopes to be in Calcutta for the meetings of the National Congress at the end of December. From thence he proposes to move southwards to Madras, and may visit Ceylon before his return to this country a few months hence. His work in India will be in sympathy with the Brahmo Samaj—on parallel, but not identical, lines.

With the object of protesting against the State regulation of vice a national conference was held at Birmingham on November 13th, Sir James Stansfeld presiding. The chairman said that years ago the Contagious Diseases Acts were denounced as irreligious, cruel, and unjust to women, demoralising to men, and unconstitutional in the highest degree. In 1886 the repeal of these Acts was carried without an adverse vote, and they now protested against any re-establishment of them. A committee had been, or was being, appointed by the Secretary of State for India to inquire into this question. There was evidence that a renewal of the Acts was being sought, and he hoped that their protest might have weight in the proper quarter. On the proposition of Mr. M. M'Laren (London), seconded by Mrs. Tanner (Bristol), a resolution was adopted condemning the State regulation of vice, and protesting against the efforts being made to induce the Government to establish in this country, India, or any part of the Empire, a system antagonistic to the moral and religious convictions of the people of the country. In the evening a public meeting was held at the Midland Institute, Mr. George Dixon, M.P., in the chair, when resolutions in conformity with that passed at the morning conference were adopted.

The powerful mind of Lord Harris, formerly Governor of Bombay, and now a Lord-in-waiting to the Queen, has, the *Daily News* fears, received a severe shock. As he told the Primrose League at Rochdale, the case for Protection is one which he finds it more and more difficult to answer. One difficulty in Lord Harris's way is that he does not seem to understand what Protection means.

"He was not," he said, "going to indulge in discussion of the subject, beyond pointing out that it was absurd to suppose any country could forego for ever that method of raising revenue."

Protection is not a method of raising revenue at all,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

and no deficiency can ever make it necessary to put on a Protective duty. Lord Harris says that India has been

"obliged to resort to the time-honoured but much derided method of Protection."

Protection honoured by time is an allegorical subject, with which a prosaic economist can hardly venture to deal. We have ourselves argued that the Indian duties on cotton, as modified by the present Secretary of State for India, are Protective. But Lord George Hamilton says they are not, and Lord Harris must settle the matter with him.

The valuable library of the India Office, the nucleus of which was formed by the old East India Company, is reported to have outgrown the accommodation provided for it in its old quarters in Whitehall. The need for an enlargement has become so urgent that Lord George Hamilton has authorised the expenditure of £15,000—of course at the expense of India—for improved and extended library accommodation; and the work, which has now been taken in hand, is expected to occupy about six months. When the work is finished, all the books and early records will be rearranged, so as to be readily accessible; and increased facilities for those engaged in researches in Oriental literature will be (gratuitously) afforded.

"THE EXPECTED FAMINE."

I.—HOW ABOUT "EXCHANGE COMPENSATION"?

It may be of interest at the present juncture to recall the memorandum which, in June, 1884, was circulated to Parliament and the Press by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. The Memorandum, which was entitled "'The Poor Man's Lamb.' Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes," was as follows:—

In 1877 and 1878 occurred the Great Madras and Bombay Famine, which, according to the official estimate, caused the deaths of 5¼ millions of people. In order to make permanent provision against such recurring disasters, Lord Lytton's Government resolved in 1878 to impose certain new taxes upon the whole of India. This additional burden took the form of a license tax (since changed into an income-tax) and certain local cesses, now known collectively as the Assessed Taxes.

Fresh taxation at such a time was looked upon with more than disfavour, and as requiring no ordinary justification to make it even tolerable. In answer to the widespread discontent thereby created, the Government of India urged that the people must be saved from famines, that this was a paramount duty of Government, but there was no fund at the disposal of Government, and that it was therefore necessary to create one to insure against future famines. In further justification of the proposed course, and to allay all possible apprehensions, the Government of India there and then entered into the most solemn pledges.

On the 27th of December, 1877, Sir John Strachey, in laying the Financial Statement of the ensuing year before the Council, after explaining the objects of the proposed taxation, said:

"I hope that no desire to carry out any administrative improvement, however urgent, or any fiscal reform, however wise, will tempt the Government to neglect this sacred trust."

On the 16th of January, 1878, he further said:

"I feel confident that I shall be able to satisfy the Council and the public that the resolution which the Government has proclaimed will be faithfully carried out, and the proceeds of these new taxes will be expended for the purpose of providing what I have called an insurance against famine, and for no other purpose whatever."

On the 9th of February, 1878, the same Member of Council carefully explained the intentions of Government in the following words:

"As I previously explained, we start with the hypothesis that in every ten years the Government of India will have to spend £15,000,000 on the relief of famine. The case will be put into its simplest form if we assume that the whole of the £15,000,000 will have to be spent at once at the end of this period, and the arguments I am about to use will not be in any way invalidated by the assumption, though it be not strictly true. Now, as the very foundation of our policy is the resolution not to permit this expenditure to create a constantly increasing charge for interest, the expedient of simply borrowing when the occasion occurs, and thus increasing the annual charges on account of debt, say, by £600,000, in each period of the years must, of course, be set aside, and it follows that we can only obtain the £15,000,000 which we require by saving up an equivalent sum in years of prosperity. If we provide for this purpose a *bonâ fide* surplus of £1,500,000 a year for ten years we shall have obtained our £15,000,000.

"I think, my lord, that I have now made it sufficiently clear how we propose to apply the £1,500,000 which we hope to provide as an insurance against famine. We shall apply it virtually to the reduction of debt; and when the calamity of famine actually arrives, we hope not only to be able to meet it without throwing fresh burdens upon the country, but to find that our means of giving efficient relief have been immensely increased by the useful works which we have carried out in the preceding years of prosperity."

Other utterances of the Finance Minister on this subject, however, appeared to be intended to qualify those specific statements, and raised doubts as to the future application of the fund. Public feeling became so strong in the matter, as shown by protests in the public press and by Members of the Council, that Lord Lytton considered it necessary to repudiate the idea that any qualification was intended, and he therefore recorded a Minute on the subject, dated the 12th March, 1878. The Viceroy wrote:

"The sole justification for the increased taxation which has just been imposed upon the people of India for the purpose of insuring this Empire against the worst calamities of future famine, so far as an insurance can now be practically provided, is the pledge we have given that a sum not less than a million and a-half sterling, which exceeds the amount of the additional contributions obtained from the people for this purpose, shall be annually applied to it. We have explained to the people of this country that additional revenue by the new taxes is required not for the luxuries, but the necessities of the State; not for general purposes, but for the construction of a particular class of public works; and we have pledged ourselves not to spend one rupee of the especial resources thus created upon works of a different character, while we exercise the most strict economy in all other branches of our expenditure, so that no greater burdens shall be thrown on the country than are absolutely required by the necessity of the case."

His Lordship then enumerated the engagements which the Government of India bound itself to fulfil, putting the following in the forefront:

"To apply sums from the surplus revenues at the rate of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

1½ million sterling per annum, in such a manner as to create what shall be, in fact, an insurance fund, from which future expenditure for famine relief can be provided for without adding to the permanent burdens on the revenues."

Apparently, a certain section of the public was not yet fully satisfied, and in March, 1879, an important deputation to Lord Lytton, which still expressed fears lest the proceeds of the special taxes might not be legitimately applied, received the following rebuke, while eliciting a further definite pledge.

Lord Lytton in replying said:

"As the representative of the Sovereign of India, I regret that such language should have been held to me by you. The sole purpose of the additional taxation you complain of was the preservation of the lives of the people of India from the effects of famine. Whatever may be the faults or shortcomings of this Government, its action in the matter to which your address makes reference was dictated by the sincerest and most anxious desire to give to the people of India the greatest protection which could practically be provided for them against the calamities of future famine. To insinuate the contrary is to insinuate a calumny."

Such were the pledges. What has been the performance? The following table (taken as to the expenditure for the years 1881-82 to 1891-92 from a table at page 12 in the Explanatory Memorandum of the Under Secretary of State for India, 1893, and as to the other figures from the various accounts of the Government of India) will show.

Table showing the Receipts from Assessed Taxes and the Expenditure on Account of Famine Relief and Insurance, from 1878-79 *to* 1893-94.

Years.	Receipts from Assessed Taxes.	Total Expenditure on Famine Relief and Insurance.	Details of Expenditure shown in Col. 3.				
			Famine Relief.	Construction of Protective Irrigation Works.	Construction of Protective Railways.		Reduction or Avoidance of Debt.
					Charged under Famine Relief and Insurance.	Charged under Railway Revenue Account	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
1878-79	900,920	313,547	313,547	—	—	—	—
1879-80	785,318	104,059	104,059	—	—	—	—
1880-81	558,720	34,840	34,840	—	—	—	—
1881-82	536,829	1,567,886	34,883	135,449	682,403	—	715,151
1882-83	517,811	1,495,972	22,103	263,443	—133,129	—	1,343,555
1883-84	526,087	1,522,813	9,205	283,223	649,248	—	581,137
1884-85	511,828	1,548,357	7,350	253,046	946,457	—	341,504
1885-86	503,031	1,529,271	40,695	186,807	589,000	29,271	683,498
1886-87	1,354,735	460,832	1,041	107,979	200,000	151,812	—
1887-88	1,431,436	376,607	402	91,006	—	285,199	—
1888-89	1,520,940	508,518	7,799	70,537	—	430,182	—
1889-90	1,595,274	1,062,909	68,288	71,457	—	462,009	460,255
1890-91	1,617,396	1,082,351	5,579	74,392	—	482,351	520,029
1891-92	1,652,823	1,500,000	23,423	77,931	484,795	231,681	682,170
1892-93	1,686,141	1,500,000	70,841	60,793	984,469	383,897	—
1893-94 estim'te	1,730,30	1,503,457	2,800	55,907	1,079,700	365,050	—
16 years.	17,429,592	16,110,519	746,855	1,731,970	5,482,943	2,821,452	5,327,299

From these figures it will be seen that the amount expended did not even equal the amount received from the Assessed Taxes. But it must be remembered that the Government refused to be bound down by the narrow limitations of a specific fund, with a debtor and creditor account. Not only did they promise not to spend one rupee of the produce of these taxes on anything but Famine Insurance, but they promised, in consideration of this new taxation and as its sole justification, to spend every year "a sum not less than a million and a-half sterling" on Famine Insurance. This they clearly have not done, and indeed the first thing that is apparent on looking at the table is the remarkable coincidence that Rx.4,000,000 were diverted from their legitimate purposes during the five years, 1887 to 1891, when the Burmah War was straining the resources of Indian Finance to their utmost.

But the real extent of the misappropriations which have been made is only apparent when we place side by side the promises and the performances of the Government of India, reduced to a simple sum in arithmetic, for the sixteen years from 1879 to 1894. In order not to complicate this comparison by the question of Exchange, the figures are shown in tens of rupees, but it must be noted that, technically, Lord Lytton's promise was to provide every year £1,500,000 sterling. If this point were insisted on, the case against the Government of India would be far worse than is here shown.

Promise of £1,500,000 a year (say)	= Rx.24,000,000
Performance in expenditure on Famine Insurance (say)	= Rx.16,000,000
Discount off the promises of the Government of India ..	Rx.8,000,000

or 33 %

Even this meagre performance would be less by nearly Rx.3,000,000 were it not for the inclusion of Rx.2,820,000 spent under Railway Revenue account, but treated by the Government of India as expenditure on account of Famine Insurance. Yet it has never been thought advisable to show this amount in the accounts under the head of expenditure for Famine Insurance; on every occasion the figures given in the tables under that heading having been explained in a footnote.

The absolute practical need for a Famine Fund is shown by past experience. Since the Crown took over the government of the country the following great famines have occurred. In Upper India 1860-61, Orissa, Behar, and Bengal 1865-66, North-West Provinces and Rajputana 1868-69, Bengal 1873-74, Madras and Bombay 1876-78, in addition to which it must be remembered that hardly a year passes by in India without scarcity in one province or another. Sir John Strachey has shown that during the twelve years preceding 1878, the famine expenditure of the Government of India had been nearly £17,000,000, made up approximately as follows:

Cost of Orissa Famine (1866)	£1,700,000
,, Bengal ,, (1874)	£6,750,000
,, S. Indian ,, (1876-7)	£9,250,000
	£17,700,000

Now let us look at the matter in the light of recent history. In the sixteen years since the taxes were imposed and the attendant pledges recorded, the Government of India can only claim, on the most favourable interpretation of their own accounts, to have fully redeemed those pledges in eight financial years. During the first three years there seems to have been no special action taken to correspond with the additional taxes levied. In the year 1881-2, under Lord Ripon and Major Baring, the Government of India fulfilled their pledges, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

continued to do so until 1885-6. In that year came the annexation of Upper Burma. This "urgent administrative improvement" proved too strong a temptation, and the "sacred trust" of Famine Insurance was "neglected" during five years to the extent of Rx.4,000,000, spent in completing the conquest of Upper Burma. In 1891 the Government of India once more accepted the responsibilities of its own pledges. This was the more easy because since 1887 the average annual yield of the special taxes had been in excess of the amount which the Government were bound year by year to set aside for Famine Insurance. But this time the adherence to pledges has been shorter. Three years only, instead of five, have elapsed before the Government of India has again yielded to temptation.

On this occasion the Famine Fund has been diverted to provide what is called Exchange Compensation Allowances, which simply mean an addition to the salaries of all non-domiciled European and Eurasian officials in India. The matter is perfectly clear. In their Budget proposals the Calcutta officials, while showing a deficit of Rx.3,500,000, have provided a sum of Rx.1,000,000 for exchange compensation allowances; and this sum has been obtained by a "temporary suspension" of the famine grant to this extent. In so doing, the governing classes in India have in effect diverted to their own use the fund which they hold in trust for the starving poor.

Truly we have over again the story of the poor man's lamb. The Indian masses and the Anglo-Indian classes are, on account of exchange, partners in misfortune. They have alike to make gold payments in England, and they alike suffer from the appreciation of gold. But the iniquity consists in this, that the rich and powerful partner ordains that his poor and powerless fellow-sufferer shall bear the burdens of both. Will the House of Commons allow this iniquity to be committed? On principle the people of India would not object to the grant of discriminating compensation to officials, but it is submitted that there should be at least a temporary suspension of any such grant until the finances of India can reasonably afford it.

II.—"THE SHEET ANCHOR OF INDIAN STATECRAFT."

The following letter from Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., dated Meredith, Gloucester, November 18th, appeared in the *Daily Chronicle* of November 19th, under the heading, "The Sheet Anchor of Indian Statecraft":—

In his report on the great Indian Famine of 1876-8, Sir James Caird calls the native village organisation "the sheet anchor of Indian statecraft," and declares his opinion that the "disruption of the mutually helpful bond of village society" is the most fatal misadventure that can befall the people in their struggle for life. In that famine some five millions of human beings died from starvation; and commenting on this experience he says, "The great difficulty hitherto felt in famine administration in India has been the disorganisation arising among multitudes of people who, when the last measure of grain is reached, break away from their villages in despair, and 'wander' in search of food or employment. The attempt to cope with this, in dealing with millions of people, overtaxes the working power of the State, and has led to frightful confusion, waste and expenditure, and to untold misery and death." Similarly in 1864, Lord Lawrence said, "The village communities, each of which is a little republic, are the most abiding of Indian institutions;" and in 1873, Sir Charles Trevelyan said, "The foundation of Indian society is the village municipality; that has been the salvation of India." With these wise sayings everyone having practical knowledge of the Indian people will agree; and the moral as regards the famine now impending is—keep the people in their villages, preserve and strengthen the village organisation, and work as far as possible through that. Further, in his admirable little work, "India: the Land and the People," Sir James Caird lays down certain humane practical maxims, which should be kept constantly in view: (1) "The most truly economical application of public relief is in such early help as will give assurance of life." When the village is deserted, and the family is scattered, depression of vitality comes on, there is no longer desire for life." It is not obstinacy that prevents persons in this condition from seeking relief, but mental depression, which should be dealt with humanely, and not by making relief repellent and unattractive. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the relief will be given in good time, and that it will be given in a form that the people will accept. (2) "There has been a mistaken desire to obtain some economical return for the food given to the people to sustain life, partly in order to reimburse the State, and partly to prevent pauperising the recipients." With regard to those considerations, Sir James Caird points out that the first object is to maintain the people not only in life but in health and working condition; and this can be better done by relieving them in the shelter of their own homes than by exacting task labour under the hardships inevitable at great relief works. And even from a money point of view he maintained that in time of severe famine the saving of food, by exacting no labour, will bear a favourable comparison with the profitable results of the costly labour of famine relief works. In any case, the annual sum set aside for famine relief in India is very small, being only about one-fiftieth per head of the annual expenditure in England on the relief of the poor. As regards the fear of pauperising the people he says, "In all Indian famines the uniform experience has been that the people at once return to their usual associations on the arrival of rain, in whatever form relief has been administered. In no instance does it appear that they have been pauperised by gratuitous help in time of famine."

III.—SPEECH BY LORD G. HAMILTON, M.P.

Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India, delivered on November 17th, at Turnham Green, an address upon the Indian famine. He said:—

Journals abroad are apt to assert that the only

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

interest which we take in the maintenance and expansion of our external Empire arises from mere selfishness and a desire to get the utmost we can out of the territories thus annexed, and to devote to them in return as little as we can. I think we may fairly contend that if we had thought of nothing but our own interests we should in many parts of the world have curtailed rather than extended our Empire. But we are prompted by a belief that wherever the British flag floats there the condition of the people under it improves, and it is our belief that this fact more than our fighting power constitutes the strength and solidarity of the British Empire.

"THE SPECTRE OF SCARCITY."

As an illustration, let me ask you to turn your attention for a few moments to what is going on at present in India. India is a continent which from time immemorial has been specially subject to scarcity and famine, yet under no dynasty or rule have such persistent and systematic efforts been made to ward off famine and its consequences from the population of the country as have been so successfully established under British rule. (Cheers.) For some months past the spectre of scarcity has overhung a considerable territory in India. That apprehension is now turned into a reality, and the battle between the forces of preservation and destruction has already begun, and must become more intense and acute till rain falls again. Let me, then, describe the area of this conflict and the relative nature of the conflicting forces at work within it. Of the vast population of India, numbering nearly 300,000,000, 80 per cent. belong to the agricultural classes. The density of the agricultural population varies according to the regularity and amount of rain in each district. Where the rain is heavy and regular the population is exceedingly thick; where irregular and scarce it is correspondingly sparse; and therefore in the past, when an occasional famine occurred with a dense population, insufficiency of food has been the great difficulty with which to contend; but in the more sparsely-inhabited districts the difficulty was one of distribution of food. Since the Government of India has been transferred to the Crown we have had to contend with several famines. In 1866 a famine occurred in Orissa, a dependency of Bengal. The country was equally inaccessible by sea or by land, and a terrible mortality ensued. Six years later there was a great famine in Bengal. Lord Salisbury was then Secretary of State for India, and I, as Under-Secretary, was his mouthpiece in the House of Commons. The Government of India were determined that life at any cost should be saved, and they succeeded; but there was a great waste of money. In the next few years there was a continual series of scarcities culminating in the great famine of 1876-78. Notwithstanding all the efforts of Government and a vast expenditure, a great mortality occurred in connection with this visitation. Sir Richard Temple was during that time Famine Commissioner. His extraordinary power of work and administration was shown by his ubiquity in the different distressed districts, and by a series of comprehensive reports which he drew up pointing out the result of the varied and painful experience which the past few years had given, and upon that report the Indian Government determined upon adopting two permanent ameliorative measures. They decided in each year to appropriate a certain proportion of the revenue of the country to a famine fund, to be devoted either to famine protective works, to the relief of famine, or to the reduction of debt; and they further decided that in every one of the provinces of India there should be drawn up a famine administration code, which was periodically to be revised and improved as experience matured.

THE PRESENT "CONFLICT."

The area which at the present moment is affected by scarcity is very large, and comprises a population of about 36,000,000 inhabitants. A very large proportion of this population will be able to help themselves, and only the residuum will come upon the Government for relief. But there is in addition a threatened district of about 18,000,000 inhabitants, and there is, further, an area partly affected and partly threatened in Native States comprising another 18,000,000 of population. The two great crops in India are harvested in the spring and autumn. The autumn crop is sown in the summer, and the spring crop is sown in the winter. The autumn crop in this area has to a large extent failed, and unless rain falls during the next two months the spring crop will fail also. The evil with which we have now to contend is serious, and it may become very grave. There is no permanent Poor Law system in India such as exists in this country, and the officials controlling the higher branches of administration in India are few and far between compared to the enormous numbers that they control; and yet, notwithstanding these difficulties, I look forward with some confidence as to the result of the conflict in which we are now engaged. In parts of the North-West Provinces there was a serious scarcity last winter. Three hundred thousand persons were at one time upon the relief works, yet so good was the system of organization and administration that outside these areas few knew of what was going on within them; and the Lieutenant-Governor, with pardonable pride at the successful close of these operations, declared that a well-administered local government could and should be able to take a scarcity in its stride. (Cheers)

IMPROVEMENTS SINCE 1878.

It is, as I have told you, nearly twenty years since I was the official mouthpiece of the India Office upon questions of famine and of scarcity, and I have during the past few weeks been carefully investigating the improvements which have taken place during that time in dealing with famines and scarcities, and which are embodied in the latest edition of the Famine Code Instructions. And you will perhaps just allow me to give you in some detail what the purport of those instructions is. In India the Government are the owners of the whole land of the country, and the revenue which they derive from the land forms a large proportion of their income. There has therefore been instituted a very elaborate system of observation in connection with the output of crops, upon which so large a proportion of their pecuniary resources depends. In every village there is an official called a "Patwari," and under the Famine Code he is desired in ordinary times to periodically report upon the condition of the crops belonging to his village, the rainfall, and any other phenomena worth notice, the rise and fall in prices, the rain register; and all the reports he so makes are sent to a registrar, who is vernacularly called a "Kinungo." He, again, sends all the reports which he receives to the subdivisional officers, from whom they go to the collector, and finally to the Commissioner, who is the highest Executive official nearest to the Lieutenant-Governor of the province. And if any staple product in any district rises 25 per cent. a special report has at once to be made from the locality in which the rise occurs. All these documents are sent to the Director of Land Revenue and Agriculture, who tests periodically their accuracy and the system in force for the supply of information, and who notes any imperfections and suggests improvements, and his reports are all sent on to the local Governor of the Province. The work, therefore, of notation, record, and observation is complete from beginning to end. A perfect network is created originating from the lowest authorities and tapering up to the highest. Every collector has to keep a list of public works for his district divided into two classes—works specially intended for the relief of the agricultural populations in the vicinity of their villages, and, secondly, works of a larger character not designed for the agricultural population near their homes, but part of a regular programme of administrative work; and lists of these works, and the numbers for whom they would provide employment, have to be annually revised by the Public Works Department, whose business it is to see to the sufficiency and suitability of the work sanctioned, and these revised lists have to be sent to every Commissioner by a given date. Now, these reports are annually made and are a regular part of the administrative rotation of every Province; but when scarcity is imminent then special reports have at once to be made as to prospects of crops, the movements of people, the condition of grain stocks, and the failure of fodder or the mortality amongst cattle, and upon the receipt of these reports every Commissioner has to put forward proposed measures of relief, the extra expenditure to be incurred, the source from which it can be defrayed, the remission of revenue to be made, the advances to be sanctioned, the number of test relief works to be opened, and the employment of the additional staff which he will require. When we advance a step further and famine is actually upon the Province, then orders are sent to every district to subordinate the ordinary objects and methods of their expenditure and administration to the special consideration of saving life. Co-operation with the Public Works Department is at once established, so that the necessary supplementary works may be opened and classified, and, when opened, reports have to be constantly and periodically sent in on the condition of those seeking relief, on the price of food, on

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the sufficiency of wages paid, on regulations for the transfer of workers from one place to another, sanitation of camps, market arrangements, and hospital accommodation. In addition to these arrangements for giving relief and employment on a large scale the whole country affected is mapped out into famine circles. A separate organisation is established in every one of these circles under a separate officer whose duty it is to visit every village in his district, to watch the migration from one village to another in order to prevent persons from going to places unable to support them, to see that gratuitous relief is given by the villages to those whose physical condition renders them incapable of self-support, and to superintend the construction and administration of poorhouses and kitchens provided for indigent children and women. I have ventured to detain you at some length with the details of this remarkable Code, for I think it is the most satisfactory official document I ever read in my life. It is a monument of patient and prescient administrative work prompted by the highest motives and based on the latest and most effective executive experience. (Cheers.)

COURAGE AND RESOLUTION OF THE PEOPLE.

It is a great mobilization of force, not to deal out death but to avert it, not to inflict suffering on man or beast but to alleviate and remove it. (Cheers.) But the extraordinary improvement which has taken place in the administrative arrangements for dealing with famine do not by any degree exhaust the advantages which the Indian Government possess over all preceding Administrations. Twenty years ago almost the same area as is now affected was the scene of a desolating famine. Within this area during the past twenty years the irrigated land has more than doubled; the railway mileage has trebled; and facilities for transport and communication have not only during that period increased inside India, but outside. Up to now in every previous famine India has had to depend upon food supplies from herself. For the first time she can now depend for food supplies upon the rest of the world, and heavy imports of grain are already beginning to arrive from America and other countries. The people are facing their difficulties with courage and resolution, and I am informed that during the last three months no fewer than 100,000 wells have been constructed out of the advances made by Government. Suggestions have been made that the Government should enter into the market and purchase grain for themselves. Our past experience shows that although the Government can buy better than one trader it cannot buy better than all private traders, and we are therefore not disposed, except in exceptional circumstances, to interfere with the ordinary trade arrangements for the movement and distribution of grain. But, however admirable a system may be, it is useless unless you have confidence in those who have to administer it. In this particular we are exceedingly fortunate. Lord Elgin during his tenure of office has given indications of exceptional ability. His capacity for work, his power of always getting to the kernel of any question he attacks, his level-headedness and determination, place him as an administrator high in the ranks even of the distinguished men who have preceded him; and in Sir Antony Macdonnell, the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, upon whom the brunt of the responsibility and anxiety must fall, we have a highly experienced and capable officer whose successful management of the scarcity of last year justifies us in believing that he will equally distinguish himself in the heavier engagement which he is now facing. We cannot now foretell the exact dimensions of the calamity with which we may have to deal, but we may be confident that never before have the organised forces of civilisation been so scientifically measured or so skilfully distributed against the inroads of famine and its attendant horrors; and I think we may confidently anticipate that the operations which are now being carried on will be associated neither with a waste of money nor the far more serious mortality which was associated with previous famine. Here we can only watch, co-operate with, and encourage those in India who are dealing with this visitation. It may be that, if the famine attains very large dimensions and the Government have to deal with a very large number of individuals seeking relief, there will be an opportunity for the employment of private agencies and public subscriptions to supplement what the Government is doing. Our assistance and relief must be given on a system which can hardly be made sufficiently elastic to meet all cases of necessity, but if it should appear to those in India that an appeal to the public for such co-operation is necessary I feel sure that the appeal will be made in England as well as in India, and that the people of this country will respond to any such demand with that sympathetic liberality which has ever characterised their response to similar appeals. (Loud cheers.)

IV.—SOME REMARKS.

Commenting on Lord George Hamilton's speech, the *Daily News* (November 18) wrote:

About a hundred and fifty persons, it is said, attended the suburban meeting which was addressed last night on the important subject of the Indian famine, by the Secretary of State for India. Whether we are to regard this as an illustration of that indifference to politics which practically makes a present of greater as well as lesser London to the Tories, or to a deplorable lack of interest in our great Indian Empire, or to some unfortunate failure on the part of Lord George Hamilton's name to draw big houses, we leave others to determine. It is certain at all events that if there is on the part of the constituencies any failure to realise what is happening in India, this apathy is not shared by the civil servants of the Crown in the vicinity of the danger.

The *St. James's Gazette*, which is not often hard to please, remarked:

Lord George Hamilton made one or two little slips in the otherwise instructive and interesting account he gave yesterday of the situation in the famine-stricken provinces of India. In describing the manner in which the provincial famine codes would be applied for the organisation of relief measures, he stated that certain functions were assigned to the Commissioner of every district. The head of a district in the North-West Provinces is the magistrate and collector; in the Punjab, the Deputy-Commissioner. A Commissioner in both provinces is the head of a division or collection of districts. The Secretary of State also seemed to ignore the Board of Revenue and the Financial Commissioners. What, however, was even more curious was the reference to district boards as being charged with the duty of organising local measures of relief. The district board, as at present constituted, is a sort of county council. In its present form it owes its existence to Lord Ripon's experiment in local autonomy.

AN INDIAN GENIUS.

A TALK WITH PROFESSOR J. C. BOSE M.A., D.SC.

Evidence of the awakened activity of the Hindu mind under English education has hitherto been visible in the departments of religion, politics and general literature, but wanting in the department of science. The circumstance was doubtless due to the great difficulty of prosecuting scientific research in India, chiefly because of the lack of well equipped laboratories where such work could be properly carried out. When it is borne in mind that numerous scientific men of high eminence are incessantly working in the different laboratories of Europe and America, furnished with the best appliances, the difficulties which beset an Indian in working out something original can easily be conceived. Yet in spite of these drawbacks, a Calcutta Professor has lately won the admiration of the scientific world, by the brilliancy of his achievements in physical science. Little more than a year ago, Professor J. C. Bose's first paper on the "Polarisation of Electric Rays" appeared in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, and drew the attention of men of science in Europe to the remarkable researches commenced at Presidency College. Two other papers, "On a New Electro-Polariscope" and "On Double-refractors in a Strained Dielectric," were shortly afterwards published in the *Electrician*. The importance, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

originality of Professor Bose's next paper, "On the Determination of the Indices of Electric Refraction," are indicated by the fact that it was accepted by the Royal Society and published in its *Proceedings*. The Society further marked its appreciation of the value of these researches by a grant from the Government Fund for their continuance. Yet another paper, "On the Determination of the Wave-length of Electric Radiation," has been recently accepted and published by the Royal Society. The University of London, in recognition of these remarkable scientific investigations, which it deemed to be of special excellence, conferred on Professor Bose the degree of Doctor of Science, the highest honour which the University can bestow. The attention of the Government of India being drawn to these scientific successes, which struck even Lord Kelvin "with wonder and admiration," Professor Bose was sent to Europe in order to lay before the British Association the results of his researches and to visit the different scientific institutions. Professor Bose's paper "On a Complete Apparatus for the study of the properties of Electric Waves," which was read before the British Association, was received with high appreciation by the savants present. They regarded it as "an event in the proceedings of the Physical Section." But the crowning recognition of Professor Bose's work has recently come from the Royal Institution whose secretary, on behalf of the managers, has requested him to deliver a Friday evening discourse from the memorable place whence Davy and Faraday used to deliver their epoch-making addresses to select audiences.

I sought out Professor Bose shortly after he had delivered his paper before the British Association at Liverpool, and asked him, for the information of the readers of INDIA, to discuss a little further his work and electrical apparatus.

Those who associate the word Professor with grave and reverend seniors, white-haired and bespectacled, will be disappointed when they see Professor Bose. He is so youthful in appearance that I mentally decided he had been appointed Professor perhaps in this very session. This proved to be an error, as he has held his present post for several years. I asked Profesor Bose to begin "right away," as our American friends phrase it, and explain the reason of his visit to England.

"I have come for two reasons," was the answer in peculiarly rapid and fluent English. "First, to read a paper at the meetings of the British Association, at Liverpool, dealing with the scientific work upon which I am engaged. Then I have come to the West, to travel a little in Europe. The Government is thinking of improving and extending our laboratories, as the present ones are insufficient and not up to date. I shall not only travel in England but on the continent, to see what laboratories other countries possess, and what we can suitably adopt in Calcutta."

"To begin at the very beginning. Do you mind saying which are your special subjects?"

"Physics, and I am specially interested in electricity. I have to lecture before a large number—about 200—of students at Presidency College. I studied at Cambridge, and was at the same time working for the B.Sc., degree of London. Yes, I hold both degrees."

"What was the subject of the paper you read before the British Association?"

"It dealt with an apparatus which I constructed for studying the properties of electric waves. Recent research has brought to light a new and vast region of forces. We knew of the properties of moderately rapid vibrations of ether which give rise to light. The slow and the exceedingly quick vibrations of ether are invisible, and little is known about them. You see, our organs of perception fail us here, and there may be many wonderful forces working around us of which we know nothing. The slow ether vibrations known as electric waves, for example, have many remarkable properties, and the apparatus I exhibited before the British Association. was for the study of these properties."

"You read, I believe, this paper before the Physical Section of the Association."

"Yes, before an audience composed of experts, amongst them some of the greatest living scientists. There were present Lord Kelvin, Sir Gabriel Stokes, Professors J. J. Thomson, Fitzgerald, Everett, Oliver Lodge, Sylvanus Thomson. Then there were the Continental physicists, Lenard, De La Rive and Bjerknes."

"Were you nervous?"

"Just a little at the beginning. It has not often fallen to me to address such a critical audience. But I soon got interested in my subject and was encouraged by the kind manner in which the paper was received. The audience seemed to be greatly interested in the working of the different parts of the apparatus, specially in the methods adopted to overcome the numerous difficulties."

"I gather from the scientific journals that the reading of your paper was regarded as an event in the proceedings of the Physical Section. I suppose your audience took a keen interest in the success of your work?"

"I think they did. You are not perhaps aware of the many difficulties in the way of carrying on original scientific investigation. For months and months you are baffled, and all progress comes to a standstill. Numerous experimental difficulties arise which at first appear insurmountable. One gets wearied and heart-sick, and at times loses all hope. It is by sheer perseverance that these difficulties are ultimately overcome. The encouragement obtained from fellow-workers enables one to tide over these periods of depression."

"Did you make all the different parts of your electrical apparatus yourself?"

"I made them with such help as Calcutta could afford. On my arrival in London, I went to the best firm of instrument makers, and asked them to make a duplicate. This they did, and also expressed a wish to make copies of the same instruments for supply in the laboratories of Europe and America."

"I suppose you have visited the leading men of science in England."

"I was first invited invited by Lord Rayleigh to see his private laboratory at Terling Place. He takes great interest in my work, and was kind

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

enough to place my papers in the hands of the Royal Society. At Lord Kelvin's invitation I visited Glasgow, indeed I have only just returned. I there met many distinguished scientific men. I also went to Cambridge. I have been asked to give a lecture at Belfast, and the Royal Institution has recently invited me to deliver a Friday evening discourse."

"Do students at Presidency College shew aptitude for scientific work?"

"Some of them do. But no good work can be accomplished unless a student after taking his degree devotes several years of his life to patient work at a subject. A degree means nothing but the laying of elementary foundations; the real work comes afterwards. Now our students as a rule are very poor. I know of many instances where the members of a family have suffered considerable privations to give a good education to their boy. When the young student gets his University degree, he feels in honour bound to look for employment, and support those who underwent such hardships for his education. In any case, he cannot afford to continue his studies after taking his degree. Post-graduate scholarships would enable some of them to devote themselves to research work, but of these we have none. Scientific research does not make for a man's personal advantage, as a rule."

"You must get hold of a great rajah, some one who will be your father and mother, as Indians say. Persuade him that the founding of scholarships will be rewarded both here and hereafter. Have you any ladies among your pupils at Presidency College?"

"No, not yet, but before I left Calcutta, we received an application from two ladies. Indian women are making very considerable progress, but in scientific education, they almost all take up medicine, since it offers more of a career for them."

"Can they make a living by it?"

"Certainly. In India there is probably a better prospect of success for a medical woman than in England, since the path is fortunately cleared for them by our customs and prejudices. All Indian women studying medicine learn the English system. Our native medicines have often been of great value, but they are now being rapidly suspended."

"You did not tell me the name of your college at Cambridge, Professor Bose?"

"Christ Church, Milton's College. It has now natural science as a speciality."

"When you travel on the Continent what cities shall you visit?"

"Those that possess good laboratories, Paris, Heidelberg, Berlin, Vienna, Zürich, and a few other cities. Although Zürich is only a small place, it has one of the finest laboratories in the world, connected with its admirable polytechnic. Having met many of the professors at Liverpool, I shall have the pleasure of renewing acquaintance with them in their own cities. There will be no difficulty as to language, for all these scientists know English thoroughly."

Later I learned from another source that the Government of Bengal voted a small sum as a permanent science research fund, to enable Professor Bose to continue his scientific work. It is encouraging to learn that the Mahárájáh of Tipperah has presented Presidency College with a magnificent telescope, and that the Bengal Government has sanctioned the constructing of a complete magnetic observatory where such problems will be studied as the frequency and intensity of magnetic storms, their terrestrial and solar disturbances. C. S. B.

Reviews.

THE BABA LOG.

The Baba Log. A Tale of Child life in India. By the REV. J. MIDDLETON MACDONALD. (London: David Nutt.)

A year ago, the preface to this volume tells us, the Rev. J. M. Macdonald, having been invited by the Cuttack children to their fancy dress ball, wrote an account of the festivities for the *Englishman* "as if he were a child guest;" and the idea "caught on" to such an extent that he has "ventured to write a simple book for children, woven round the real life of our English Baba Log in India." It may at once be frankly stated that the world would have been little poorer had the reverend gentleman resisted the temptation. The volume now published shews little trace of the germ from which it sprang, if we except a chapter in the middle containing a description of a fancy dress ball. This is evidently the author's strong point, his show trick, which had to be led up to; what precedes and what follows are merely prelude and conclusion respectively. Of the child's point of view there is little evidence. We have no hesitation in saying that never children spake as these children speak. The twins who play the central *rôle*, and by judicious questions that recall the illustrious Sandford and Merton of our ancestors enable the author to express his opinions and air his knowledge, are as unnatural though not as amusing as a similar pair who have figured in recent fiction. They rejoice in much more high-sounding titles, it is true, being christened Dering Oldrid Norton Blunt and Frederica Adrianne Yolande Blunt; as is incumbent on aristocratic infants they associate only with playmates of equally euphonious names, such as Cicely, Varony, and Antonia. The appearance of one Polly Hope is quite a relief and the reader feels that he may at last unbend a little. But in all essentials the twins follow the example of their prototypes, and by carefully timed questions give the author an opening for little lectures on ancient architecture, the education of women, Hindu mythology, Indian history, and Jameson's raid. The various adult characters are merely disguises through which are seen the features of the Rev. J. M. Macdonald; the children merely give the cue. Even the "baby talk" is Mr. Macdonald's and reminds us of the uncouth gambols of the affectionate ass in Æsop. At times the sententiousness which characterises the book descends to the level of priggishness. Here is an expression of opinion on women's magazines.

"Quite half the magazine is taken up with full-length portraits of a Paris gown or opera cloak. . . . hardly a page of mental food in the whole magazine. The proprietors of these magazines ought to combine to level up the thoughts of the average British matron."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

A certain lack of sense of proportion is evident in the words of a Commissioner who after three shots, fired at a native baby by mistake, which have fortunately missed, says:—

"Thank heaven I didn't fire. I should never have been forgiven *by the native press* if I had killed that baby."

The italics are ours.

After this the reader will not be surprised to find that the wit with which the volume is relieved, here and there, is of a ponderous order. A story which is deemed worthy of a place in the *farrago* turns on the custom in various Christian societies of changing the names of the devotees. Says an old Plymouth woman:—

"'But look 'ere, sir, I've got one think agin the Horder. My son was called Binjamin afore 'e was born, and Father 'Opkins 'as gone and called him Brother Anthony.'

"The padre says he clean bolted with a grave face, but shrieking internally, and when he got up the stairs into Father Chase's study he laughed for ten minutes without stopping."

The padre's sense of humour must have been abnormally developed.

If Mr. Macdonald's efforts are characterised by a lack of definite purpose, continuity, plot, or incident, yet the book might at a pinch be made to serve the purpose of a Hindustani Ollendorf. The utterances of servants and others are printed in dialect, and followed by English translations in square brackets. For the correctness of style and idiom we cannot vouch. But there is much fluent patter about hathis, chaprasis, chota hazri, and so on. For the rest we find a considerable quantity of Anglo-Indian small talk, a few odds and ends of information on local topics, and an occasional anecdote of no particular merit or point. Wedged in an after-dinner conversation there is a (presumably gratuitous) two-page advertisement of a religious order which has founded a priory at Alton in Hampshire. We never heard of the Order of St. Paul. But we cannot pay the author's imagination the credit of inventing it without stronger grounds than his work furnishes. Finally there is some discussion of current topics such as the salt-tax, and the question of representative councils in India, on which the author expresses sound views, but views in no way original or even remarkable from the lips of a non-official Anglo-Indian. On the whole he succeeds best when he packs the children off to bed, abandons the effort to talk down to their level, and is frankly prosaic and commonplace. Apparently the volume is intended to form part of the series of charming gift-books for children which is being published by Mr. David Nutt. There is reason for fear that any kind-hearted uncle who is attracted by the delightful type and general appearance of the book, or by the very successful reproductions of photographs that appear as illustrations, will run the risk of gaining from his nephews and nieces more credit for his intentions than his actual deeds. Most children of the present day, we think, are likely to vote the Rev. J. M. Macdonald a bore.

A FIRST BOOK OF JURISPRUDENCE.

A First Book of Jurisprudence for Students of the Common Law. By SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, Bart. (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. 1896.)

This little volume is a most admirable production. It is addressed to readers who have laid the foundation of a liberal education and are beginning the special study of law. But it may be doubted whether these readers, grateful as they will be for Sir Frederick Pollock's aid, will be able to value it at quite its full worth. To do that it is perhaps necessary for one to have read law without this book and then, turning to it, to realize how much would have been gained from the "helping hand" and the "warning voice" in the "stage of confusion and illusion" through which every student must make his way in his own fashion. Needless to say, what the Corpus Christi Professor of Jurisprudence in the University of Oxford gives us is not a short cut to knowledge. Still less is it a cram-book for the "Bar final." It seeks to set forth, in language intelligible to scholars who are not yet lawyers, so much of the general ideas underlying legal discussions as is needful for the removal of the most pressing difficulties. At the same time it is intended to lighten the first steps of the beginner in the practical use of law-books and the appreciation of legal authorities. A man who has taken "Greats" and is beginning to read law finds, as Sir F. Pollock says, in the new literature he has to master, many leading conceptions and distinctions which are assumed to be familiar, and are so to lawyers, but which, for that very reason, are not often expressly stated, still less often discussed, and hardly ever explained. "He has not only to discover for himself, often with much bewilderment, the actual contents of legal terms, but to realise the legal point of view and the legal habit of mind." Accordingly the first part of the book deals with "Some General Legal Notions." Here Sir Frederick Pollock discusses such topics as the nature and meaning of law, justice according to law, the subject-matter of law, divisions of law, persons, things, events and acts, possession and ownership, and relation of obligations to property. The second part, which need not be read last, treats of "Legal Authorities and their Use," under these headings: the express forms of law, the sources of English law, sovranty in English law, custom in English law, law reports, case-law and precedents, and ancient and modern statutes. As to this second and more "practical" part, Sir F. Pollock writes: "No practical art can really be taught; one man can only help another to learn; but it is common experience that such help will often save a great deal of trouble. Certainly no man ever learned to shoot by being lectured on the construction of a rifle, and yet such lectures are a regular part of musketry instruction." We have merely indicated the general scope of a scholarly work which will be simply invaluable to all serious students of law, and which, in point of style and method, stands in pleasing contrast with the ordinary law books.

We have received from Mr. Henry Frowde a copy of the new edition of Sir William Hunter's delightful story "The Old Missionary," which we reviewed at length on a former occasion. The popularity of the book is indicated by the eloquent announcement on the title-page "twenty-first thousand." The present edition is a handsome production, not unworthy of the artistic traditions of the Oxford University Press.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

NOVEMBER, 1896.

CHAMBERS'S JOURNAL. Cater, R. W., "India-Rubber Gatherers."

DUBLIN REVIEW. Mackenzie, G. T., "An Experiment in Education in Madras."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 2 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.). Beck, Theodore, M.A., "Englishmen in India." Bisvas, Nakur Chandra, "A Visit to a Sonthal's Hut." Satthianadhan, S., M.A., "What has English Education done for India." Karkaria, R. P., "A Legend of Abkar."

PEARSON'S MAGAZINE. Machray, Robert, "Calcutta and Bombay."

PALL MALL MAGAZINE. Gough, General Sir Hugh, "Old Memories of the Indian Mutiny."

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE. Ralph, Julian, "My Indian Plunder." Melliss, Capt. C. J., "Panther-shooting in Central India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

NOVEMBER, 1896.

KIPLING, RUDYARD ..... "Soldier Tales." (Macmillan) ..... 6s. 0d.

I-TSING ..... "A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago." (Henry Frowde) 14s. 0d.

STONE, S. J. ..... "In and Beyond the Himalayas." Illustrated. (Arnold.) .. 16s. 0d.

HAYENS, HERBERT ..... "Clevely Sahib, a tale of Khyber Pass." (Nelson) ..... 5s. 0d.

"LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE EAST INDIA COMPANY FROM ITS SERVANTS IN THE EAST." (Sampson Low, Marston and Co.) ..... 21s. 0d.

HUNTER, SIR WILLIAM WILSON, LL.D. ..... "Life of Brian Houghton Hodgson, British Resident at the Court of Nepal, etc." (John Murray) ..... 14s. 0d.

POLLOCK, COLONEL ..... "Fifty Years' Reminiscences of India." Illustrated. (Edwin Arnold) ..... 16s. 0d.

"REPORT OF THE LORD REAY MEMORIAL FUND." (Bombay: *Times of India* Press) ..... — —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[8238.] STATISTICAL ABSTRACT RELATING TO BRITISH INDIA, from 1885-86 to 1894-95. Thirtieth Number. 8vo. ..... 1s. 3d.

[8258.] INDIAN EXPENDITURE COMMISSION—Vol. I. First Report of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Expenditure of India; with Minutes of Evidence, etc. .... 4s. 8d.

[8259.] DITTO—Vol. II. Appendices ..... 3s. 3d.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

OUDH COMMERCIAL BANK, Ld.
FYZABAD, OUDH.
ESTABLISHED 1881.
CAPITAL—Rs. 2,00,000. RESERVE FUND, Rs.65,000.
FIXED DEPOSITS are received as under:—
At 6 per cent. withdrawable 18 months after notice.
" 5½ " " 12 " " "
Banking business of every description transacted.
RAM SARAN DAS, M.A., F.A.U., M.A.S.B., *Manager*.

THE CHAMPION.
A Weekly Journal Published in the Interests of the People of India.
SUBSCRIPTION IN ADVANCE, RS. 10 PER ANNUM.
SINGLE COPY, 4 ANNAS.
This Journal circulates over the whole of the Indian Empire
For Rates for Advertisements, apply to the Manager.
OFFICES—GREEN STREET, FORT, BOMBAY.

THE INDIAN AND EASTERN ENGINEER
AN ILLUSTRATED WEEKLY JOURNAL
FOR ENGINEERS IN INDIA AND THE EAST.
The "INDIAN AND EASTERN ENGINEER" contains the latest and most authentic information on all subjects connected with Engineering enterprise in India and the East.
Correspondence invited on any subject which may be of interest to the profession.
Rate of Subscription (payable in advance, including a copy of the INDIAN AND EASTERN ENGINEER'S DIARY, and postage):—
India, Rs. 20 yearly; England, 40s. yearly.
PUBLISHED AT 137, CANNING STREET, CALCUTTA.
LONDON OFFICE: 28, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

TRADE MARK. JVARA-HARI. TRADE MARK.
Is what its name implies, **FEVER DESTROYER,**
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." FOR FEVER I know. Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY
North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
C. E. WOOD, Captain 22nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.
Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK
I have much pleasure in stating that you in the early stage
Cuddalo Municipal Councillors' Office,
'Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.
Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free.
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,
HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. AND 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.
CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 1. MARCH, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 11th to 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

February 11th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

SIAM, THE PAMIRS, AND CHITRAL.

The second Session of the 14th Parliament of Her Majesty the Queen was opened by Commission.

The Queen's Speech, which was read by the Lord Chancellor, contained the following passages relating to India:—

"An agreement has been concluded between my Government and that of the French Republic, having for its principal object the more secure establishment of the independence of the Kingdom of Siam. A copy of it will be laid before you.

"The Commissioners for the delimitation of the frontier separating my Indian Empire and the territory of Afghanistan from the dominions of the Emperor of Russia have agreed upon a line which has been accepted by myself and by the Emperor. . . . .

"On the north-west frontier of my Indian Empire the measures taken last year to secure an effective control over Chitral have been successful, and the engagements entered into by the border tribes for the maintenance and protection of the road from Peshawar have been loyally carried out without molestation or disturbance."

THE ADDRESS.—SIAM.

Lord STANMORE, moving "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty in reply to the Speech from the Throne," said in the course of his speech:—The agreement between this country and France with regard to the neutralisation of a great part of the kingdom of Siam is now completed, and is, therefore, open and subject to criticism, nor can it be affected by whatever is said. It may seem to some paradoxical, but I confess that I for one view that agreement with great satisfaction for the very reason that it affords nothing like a brilliant triumph to either party to the agreement. The complement of triumph is humiliation, and where humiliation exists there is usually soreness and disappointment; and if the party humiliated be a great State, the consequences may be decidedly mischievous. Triumph is a legitimate thing very often, except when you have overcome right and established wrong; but in the case of negotiations conducted on an equal footing between two parties who are equally convinced of their rights, and who are acting in perfectly good faith and honour, I am not at all sure that the solid advantage is always on the side of the party which has gained a triumph. I think this agreement ought to be regarded as satisfactory by all those who do not misunderstand it. But it has been misrepresented, and therefore, I suppose, has been misunderstood. It is said that what this agreement does is virtually to partition Siam; that we have put the king, in what remains of his dominions, under the tutelage of two great Powers, and that they have taken the remnant to themselves. Nothing could be more inaccurate or unjust. The provinces of Siam which are not referred to in this agreement stand exactly on the same footing now as they did before the agreement. Should any interest, British or French, be affected in those provinces, either to the east or the west or centre of Siam, there is nothing to prevent those interests being safeguarded and looked after exactly as before. What has been done is this—that whereas before this agreement the whole of the kingdom of Siam was in the same condition as these provinces are now, the central and most important provinces of Siam have now been guaranteed in their neutrality. Neither France nor England can, without the consent of the other, move an armed force into that territory, and the two Powers are prepared to prevent any third Power from doing that which they themselves refrain from. That arrangement is a great advantage to the two great Powers concerned. It relieves them from many misgivings, it sets at rest many suspicions, and it prevents much misunderstanding. It is an advantage to Siam, because it leaves that country free to employ its whole resources in its own development, instead of in useless military defences which, in case of need, would probably serve it in very bad stead. It is a service to the whole world in settling questions which might give rise to unpleasant discussions in the future. It is true that Mongsin has been given up, and I admit fully that I mourn for the loss of that possession. To recede from territory once gained is, in Oriental countries, always attended with some risk. But if ever the risk in retrocession were reduced to a minimum, it is in this case. Mongsin is not a populous and extensive province; it is a triangle of earth not larger than one of the smallest of English counties, with a population of less than 2,000, and with a reputation of possessing an especially deadly climate. The exchange of a land frontier for a fixed and evident river boundary is an absolute gain; and, at all events, the price paid is well worth paying for the satisfaction of effecting an agreement which sets at rest so many matters of dispute.

The EARL OF ROSEBERY, in the course of his speech, said: I pass now to the agreement with Siam. The mover told us that the agreement with Siam filled him with unqualified satisfaction. I cannot help wondering, with all respect to him, whether it would have filled him with the same unqualified satisfaction if it had been concluded by my noble friend (Lord Kimberley).

Lord STANMORE: Yes.

The EARL OF ROSEBERY: I accept his assurance. I know that he has an impartial mind. (Laughter.) I do not know

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

whether I am to accept the assurance of the noble lord as to what his attitude would have been, but I must say that it is not such an arrangement as might have been anticipated from the speeches of the present party in power when they were in opposition. We have given up a great deal by that arrangement, and what *quid pro quo* we have received for it we shall hear, no doubt, from the noble marquis when he speaks; but we have not been informed as yet. We have given up the principle of the buffer State. We have given up Mongsin, and the noble lord the mover of the Address thinks little of it. But Mongsin has been occupied by a British force, and when there was the question of the evacuation of Chitral we were told, I think by the First Lord of the Treasury, that the first principle of this Government was that where a British soldier had once been there he must always remain. Thirdly, we have given up the British dominions on the other side of the Mekong river. Fourthly, we have taken the Mekong as our boundary between France and ourselves, in direct disregard of the advice of the principal local authority on that matter. If I might again quote Mr. Curzon, whose defence of this arrangement I shall go to the gallery of the other House to hear, I must state that I remember, when we were in office, he attached a special value to the retention of the dominions on the other side of the Mekong. I am not going to make any remarks on the inferences which I draw from the language of the treaty. I would rather have it explained by the noble marquis; but whatever inferences I may draw from its natural language, I cannot express, for fear any argument should be built upon them in the French Chamber in the discussion that is soon to take place there. But I must honestly say that I think we have a right to some explanation from the Government as to what are the advantages in exchange for which they have given up the four very valuable points to which I have referred. But, tacked on to Siam, were a couple of other quarters of the globe. There is a Commission with regard to our territories on the banks of the Niger. If that Commission does its work well, I for one have no criticism to offer; and, lastly, Tunis is brought in in connexion with that strange arrangement. Our treaty with Tunis is, so far as I can understand the language of the instrument, to be put an end to and to be negotiated afresh—a very important concession as bearing on the interests of Italy as well as ourselves, and one on which I hope we shall have some explanation from the noble marquis.

The MARQUIS OF SALISBURY, following Lord Rosebery, said in the course of his speech:—When I come to the Foreign Office matters on which the noble lord was more distinct, the first I must deal with is the Treaty of Siam. The noble lord has told us we have sacrificed some very important things. Amongst others, he made out two bits of territory we had sacrificed instead of one. I think that is a geographical error on his part. There has been nothing given up but this minute portion of Mongsin, which in past times paid tribute to Burma, Siam, and China, and which therefore the French Government claimed as confidently as we. Of course we held that they were absolutely wrong.

The EARL OF ROSEBERY: It is the noble Marquis that is making a geographical mistake. (Laughter.)

The MARQUIS OF SALISBURY: We will wait until we get to maps. (Laughter.) But when the noble lord tells me that the treaty has been concluded in defiance of the wishes of the local authorities, I can only say it has been concluded in entire accordance with the recommendations and wishes of the Government of India. It was the wishes and recommendations of the Government of India that largely induced us to conclude this treaty. The danger I wish to guard against—and I hope I can do so without indiscretion—is, I think, very obvious. However anxious the French Government may be to remain at peace, however laudable their conduct may be, there was always a possibility, and more than a possibility, that in these relations with Siam causes of difference would arise, and if those causes of difference had matured in the conflict, and the danger had arisen of the disappearance of the kingdom of Siam, a very formidable question would have been placed before this country. I should not have thought that the noble lord, after his experience of the difficulties attaching to the Siamese negotiations, would have been inclined to treat with contempt that apprehension which it was legitimate to feel with respect to the future of that kingdom. At all events, whatever those apprehensions were, in my judgment they were much more serious than appear to have been in the mind of the noble lord. Whatever those apprehensions were, they are now at an end, because, by the agreement of the two Powers most interested in the matter, the integral and essential portion, and the most prosperous and fruitful portion, of the Siam kingdom is protected against all possibility of attack. I believe that has removed all chance of serious difference in the future with a great European Power, and in the present state of the world I do not think that it is otherwise than a matter of congratulation. Of course I am quite ready to admit with my noble friend behind me that the treaty is not one in regard to which either Power can at all in any way triumph over the other. On the contrary, I think it is a treaty which both Powers have a right to rejoice in, because it will reserve to each all the rights and privileges to which they have any claim, and at the same time add additional security to their possession and harmonious existence in the future. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

Koer, Musst Shyan.—Petition of Musst Shyan Koer, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

Khan, Sulaimon.—Petition of Sulaimon Khan, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

Singh, Bhaj.—Petition of Bhaj Singh, for enquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Warlike Operations: Killed and Wounded). Return presented relative thereto [Address 5th March, 1895; Mr. Alpheus Morton]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Kythal). Return presented relative thereto [Address 22nd August, 1895; Mr. Kimber]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Loans raised in England). Copy presented of Return of all Loans raised in England, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1895, etc., [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Loans raised in India). Copy presented of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1895, etc., [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

India Office. Copy presented of Order in Council, dated 12th December, 1895, approving a Statement of a revised appointment and alteration of salary in the Establishment of the Secretary of State for India in Council [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

THE ADDRESS.

CHITRAL AND SIAM.

Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN, Jun., moving the Address in answer to the gracious Speech from the Throne, said in the course of his speech: The campaigns of Ashanti and Chitral have one strong point of resemblance, for, although the latter was not of the same peaceful character as the former, yet its success was largely due to the perfection of organisation, of which the Government of India are so proud. It is our pride and boast that ours is an island home, but it is not only its shores that we have to protect. We have to protect other frontiers, and it is the watching and guarding of those frontiers which occasionally involves us in disputes. It is with much satisfaction we learn that the controversies with regard to the delimitation of our frontiers in the East had a successful issue. This issue has not been due to a diplomatic triumph of one country over another, but it is rather the outcome of a friendly agreement between the Powers, and therefore, I venture to think, the more likely to prove firm and lasting.

Mr. R. MCKENNA said he would not have ventured to intervene except in the hope of obtaining information from the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who in a previous debate had described himself as having peculiar means of knowledge of affairs in Siam. This information might now assist him in understanding the apparent complete change in policy in regard to Anglo-French relations with Siam. In 1893 the Under Secretary had laid it down that "the main British interest in Siam is the political stability of Siam itself." He was aware

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

that the hon. gentleman would allege that this stability was secured by the treaty. But on another occasion the hon. gentleman had used language which condemned in advance such stability as the treaty secured. He said: "Attention is called to the Provinces of Battambong and Angkor. . . . . They are rich in rice and other produce, and include the upper part of the Great Lake, with its important and lucrative fisheries. . . . . The possession of the Provinces is essential to Siam; and, in fact, the independence and integrity of Siam will be irretrievably injured if those Provinces are allowed to pass into the hands of any foreign Power." The treaty which was supposed to guarantee the integrity and independence of Siam did not include these very provinces within its scope, and in consequence the situation which the Under Secretary then described existed at the present moment. For, in the same speech, the hon. gentleman said: "These Provinces have not been seized by the French, but let me explain the ingenious substitution for seizure which is substituted." The pith of that "ingenious substitution for seizure" was the occupation of Chantaboon, which the French still occupied at the present moment. He would not speak of the surrender of territory undeniably British on the upper reaches of the Mekong, but he would ask what compensation Great Britain received for the sacrifice of what the Under Secretary had described as the main British interest in Siam.

Sir CHARLES DILKE said, in the course of his speech: He now came to a point on which he took the sharpest issue with the policy of the Government. He could not imagine a statement more untruthful, as it seemed to him, than that contained in what was virtually the first paragraph of the Speech. It was said: "An agreement has been concluded between my Government and that of the French Republic, having for its principal object the more secure establishment of the independence of the Kingdom of Siam." What was the policy which the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs last year recommended to the House, and which was supported by the whole authority of the Conservative Party? It was the integrity of the whole country of Siam, of all that was left, as he said, after the treaty which had been made between France and Siam. The hon. gentleman specifically mentioned two provinces as being portions of the country the integrity of which ought to be preserved. He believed the Government were going to tell them that the integrity of Siam was preserved by the treaty they had made, but every man smiled at that statement. Everyone knew that at the time the treaty was negotiated between France and Siam, and when we intervened, the Siamese objected to two articles the French pressed upon them. The hon. gentleman told them that Chantabon was a port, the integrity of which should be maintained on account of the large British trade there. It was well known that what had been done was to guarantee the centre of Siam, and not to guarantee the remainder of the country, which seemed to him a direct invitation to other people to annex it. ("No.") What was the consideration this country had got for a surrender which, to judge from the language Lord Rosebery used, was a surrender of a very important branch of British trade? Was it coming to a full and fair arrangement with France which might relieve us from those anxieties in the world which bad arrangements with France undoubtedly occasioned us, when there was a handing over of our influence over the Siamese part of the Malay Peninsula? The Convention contained a clause about Tunis. We had certain trade rights with Tunis. Those rights gave us very low duties, and through them we did a very large trade. It was well known that the French Protectionists desired to hamper that trade for the supposed benefit of the trade of France. There was a clause in the Siamese Convention by which we seemed to go out of our way to promise to discuss with the French our relations with Tunis, from which the French understood we were prepared to give up our rights there. He feared the whole history of Lord Salisbury's conventions with France and Germany went to show that, in regard to what the noble lord considered smaller and secondary questions, he did not sufficiently study the interests of British trade. He complained that the concessions which were made in the name of British trade were useless concessions, because they did not deal with those larger questions which the French had in view, and did not produce that complete friendly relation throughout the world which we had a right to anticipate if we made the concessions at all. They fell short or they went too far—the former for the purposes of a complete settlement, and the latter for the interests of British trade. The question which lay behind all these others was the question of the occupation of Egypt. (Hear, hear.) Everybody knew that some believed that this country had not kept her word with regard to Egypt, and others believed that the letter of that word had been rigidly kept; but all knew what the opinion in France was on the point. Some, and the number was increasing even on the Ministerial side of the House, believed with him that, from a military point of view, the occupation of Egypt was a weakness and not a strength. The question of the occupation must be settled to bring about really friendly relations with France, if it were not too late altogether to restore those relations. But that was no reason why, in the interests of British trade, protests should not be made against conventions which gave up important trade interests, and particularly against the hypocrisy of such language as that in the Queen's Speech stating that the object of the agreement had been to secure the greater independence of Siam. (Hear, hear.)

February 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS FOR SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

Civil Service of India.—Petitions for open competitive examinations simultaneously in England and India, from Gorakpur, Mysore, Vayalpad, Sholapur, Madras, Rayapuram, Virapandi, Pudukota, and Ramanasanmithurum; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Loans raised in England). Paper (presented 11th February) to be printed. [No. 14.)

East India (Loans raised in India). Paper (presented 11th February) to be printed. (No. 15.)

East India (Examinations for the Civil Service). Copy presented of Regulations for the open competition of August, 1896 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

AFGHANISTAN AND THE KAFIRS.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Her Majesty's Government had received confirmation of a statement made in several Indian newspapers, to the effect that, according to an announcement by the Afghan Commander-in-Chief, military operations would be resumed by the Afghans against the Kafirs of the Hindu Kush in the first week of March;

Whether the extirpation or enslavement of the Kafir race was contemplated as a possible contingency when the transfer to Afghanistan of the whole of the Kafir country up to Chitral was made under the Durand Agreement, as stated in the recently published Chitral Blue-book; and, if so, what steps were being taken to save the people from such a fate;

And, whether the text of the Durand Agreement or Treaty would be laid before the House of Commons.

Lord G. HAMILTON: (1) Her Majesty's Government has received no confirmation of the report that military operations will be resumed against the Kafirs in March. The latest report is that operations were practically ended on January 24th, troops withdrawn, and most hostages released.

(2) The main object of the Durand Agreement—the text of which I shall be glad to lay on the Table of the House—was to fix the limits of the respective spheres of influence of the two Governments, and thus put an end to the difficulties arising from the want of such a delimitation. According to the latest reports received from the Government of India no question of "the extirpation or enslavement of the Kafir race" has arisen; and certainly no such contingency was contemplated at the time the arrangement was arrived at.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he could state why the agreement between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of France, relative to Siam and to Tunis, dated the 15th January, 1896, as published in the French Yellow Book, was put in the form and under the title of a Declaration:

And, whether that form and title implied any difference between its permanent binding force and that of a Convention.

MR. CURZON: The agreement is entitled a Declaration in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

accordance with precedent; for instance, the agreement between Great Britain and France of August 5th, 1890, relative to territories in Africa. There is no difference whatever between its permanent binding force and that of a Convention.

THE TRANSVAAL QUESTION AND THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER seconded Mr. Labouchere's amendment to the Address as follows: "And we humbly represent to your Majesty that no investigation into recent occurrences in South Africa will be complete unless it extends to the financial and political action of the Chartered Company of South Africa, since your Majesty granted to certain persons the original charter under which the Company is incorporated."

In the course of his speech Mr. Arnold Forster said: What was the real and true objection, not only to this chartered company, but to every chartered company? That they were mixing up totally dissimilar things—things not only dissimilar, but which ought on every principle of ethics and good sense to be eternally dissociated—the right to govern men and the desire to make money. (Hear, hear.) They were told that the love of money was the root of all evil, yet they had deliberately, by the constitution of this company, made the love of money the prevailing motive of every officer of the company. He did not find fault with any corporation formed to make money. We were all money-hunters in one sense or other. Some succeeded, others failed. Some hunted for money honestly, others dishonestly, and brought themselves within the pale of the criminal law. The House had divested itself of its prerogative—the government of Her Majesty's subjects—and placed it in the hands of these people, whose reason for existence was to make money. So it was incumbent upon them to see how this power was used or abused. The experiment of chartering such companies had been tried over and over again, and had failed. Lord Clive—the greatest man we ever sent to India—found there were conditions in regard to the East India company which made good government impossible. Lord Clive spent the best years of his life resisting the corruption resulting from private trading on the part of officials of the company. The charter was neglected, and the people of India suffered injury and injustice in consequence. He might be told that during the last thirty or forty years of its existence the East India was without blemish or blame. That was when it ceased to be a monopolist trading company, and became a department of the Government of the country, with a Civil Service similar to that which governed the empire at the present time.

Later in his speech, Mr. Arnold Forster added: The whole situation, to his mind, was an absolutely false one. Their Imperial rule had been sometimes a mischievous one; on the whole he believed it to be a good and judicious one. But what was the good thing they had got out of it all? It was that wherever the English Government had gone it had taken with it the traditions of honourable fair dealing and honesty. (Hear, hear.) Their Indian Civil Service was a great example of this, for, however poor and obscure one of its members might be, the wealth of India would not buy him, or any pecuniary consideration make him swerve from his loyalty to the service of this country; or, if he did, his own profession would cut him, and his career would be ruined and blasted. (Hear, hear.) But who were the officers, magistrates, colonels, captains, and Heaven knew what, of the chartered company? They were all honourable men he had no doubt, but they were not under Imperial control like their Indian Civil servants, and the moment they resigned neither the chartered company nor those who cared for the empire had any authority over them, and they might gasconade in some other part of the world the very next month. (Hear, hear.) That was not the sort of material out of which they had built up or could safely conduct their empire. (Hear, hear.)

February 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether his attention had been drawn to the fact that the British Indian subjects of Her Majesty residing in South Africa had hitherto been treated differently to the rest of Her Majesty's subjects with regard to certain rights and privileges:

And, whether he would take steps in future arrangements with the Government of the South African Republic to secure to British Indian subjects in that region the same treatment as was extended to all other British subjects.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I am aware of the facts and will not lose sight of the subject. As regards the Commandeering Treaty, the hon. member has been already informed that steps have been taken to prevent the introduction of a colour distinction. As regards the restriction on trading and domicile our hands are not so free, owing to the result of the arbitration which leaves the matter in the hands of the Transvaal Courts. But I have undertaken to use any influence I may possess in order to secure fair treatment of all our fellow-subjects irrespective of colour.

THE ADDRESS.

THE TRANSVAAL AND THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

Sir W. HARCOURT, in the course of his speech on Mr. Labouchere's amendment to the Address, said:—The relation of this country to companies which, as the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Chamberlain) said, are not able or are not willing to control their agents is one that must be decided by this House, because we are responsible to the nation for the conduct of such companies. The right hon. gentleman has declared his approval of the system of chartered companies; I reserve my own opinion, for I think there is a great deal to be said on both sides; but everybody is agreed that the conditions of the South Africa Company's Charter must be changed; indeed, the right hon. gentleman has changed them himself; and, therefore, the conditions under which chartered companies are to be founded in the future obviously form a question to be inquired into by Parliament. Our predecessors took that view. In the great controversy of the end of last century with reference to the East India Company, when the party of Fox on one side and the party of Pitt on the other took different views as to our dealings with the East India Company, everybody was agreed that Parliament should decide what was to be the relation of the Empire to the East India Company. There was a great discussion, and there was a great report by Dundas and others, which are monumental records among the journals of this House, and upon them was founded the system of that Board of Control which was erected for the express purpose of restraining the action of the Chartered Company in Hindustan. Since that time there have been a great many Indian Committees; the matter has been gone into over and over again; and we should entirely fail in the duty imposed upon us, in the situation in which we find ourselves, if we did not claim and insist upon the right of Parliament to decide a great Imperial question.

February 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. M'KENNA asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention had been called to the concluding words in the communication of M. Berthelot to M. Guieysse, contained in the recently issued French Yellow-book relating to the affairs of Siam and the Upper Mekong, in which he alluded to the execution of the treaty of October 3rd, 1893, as remaining incomplete; and whether he had any information as to the particulars in respect of which the said treaty was alleged to be still incomplete.

Mr. CURZON: I have seen the words in question. The particulars referred to are understood to relate to the provisions connected with the 25 kilomètre zone.

FIELD HOWITZERS.

Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether his attention had been called to the fact that, while the Indian Government had decided to commence the [illegible] new field howitzer for land service with a calibre of 5·4 inches, the War Office had simultaneously

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

sanctioned the manufacture of a field howitzer for the use of the Home and Colonial Army with a calibre of 5·0 or 5·2 inches;

Whether he was aware that the ammunition, limber cases, and ammunition waggons for the respective guns referred to were not interchangeable;

Whether he would give the House an assurance that immediate steps would be taken to reconcile the difference between the India and Home Departments, and thus avoid the confusion which must arise from the simultaneous adoption of the two guns;

And, whether he would state whether any person was responsible for securing uniformity of pattern in essential matters between the armament and equipments of the Indian and the Home armies respectively, and what was the name of, and the office held by, such person.

Mr. BRODRICK: An application was made in 1889 by the Government of India for a howitzer to throw a 60lb. shell. It was found that for such a shell a 5·4 calibre was necessary. The howitzer supplied for the Home and Colonial army is a 5 in. howitzer throwing a 50lb. shell, and the ammunition and equipment are not interchangeable. The Indian Government required a special type of howitzer to form part of a siege train drawn by bullocks intended for shelling stone or mud forts, while the howitzer used for the Home and Colonial army is required for field batteries and has necessarily to be light and drawn by horses. The two guns are intended for different purposes, and it is anticipated that for use with field batteries the Indian Government will adopt the 5 in. howitzer. The Secretary of State is strongly of opinion that the multiplication of calibres is undesirable; and care will be taken to make all arms and ammunition, whether for use at home or elsewhere, interchangeable except in cases when for local reasons a difference is inevitable. The Government of India is represented on the Ordnance Committee by whom new patterns of weapons are examined. In cases where the War Department and the India Office are unable to agree the Defence Committee of the Cabinet will be asked to decide.

Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER asked if he was to understand that the manufacture of these dissimilar guns was to be continued.

Mr. BRODRICK said the manufacture of these arms commenced early in 1894. The guns were ready for issue and it was impossible to stop them.

PRISON-MADE GOODS.

Mr. J. H. DALZIEL asked the President of the Board of Trade whether any reply had been received to the representations made to foreign Governments in respect to prison-made goods; and what action, if any, the Government proposed to take in the matter?

Mr. RITCHIE: The replies received from foreign Governments, while sympathetic, do not lead Her Majesty's Government to hope that it will be possible at present to bring about an agreement for common action in the matter. Under these circumstances, the Government consider that, in view of the Resolution unanimously passed by the House of Commons on February 19 last, Parliament should have the opportunity of giving legislative effect to that Resolution. My hon. and gallant friend the member for Central Shefficld has, I observed, introduced a Bill with that object. I hope the opportunity desired may be afforded by that Bill.

Mr. DALZIEL asked whether the right hon. gentlemen could lay upon the Table the correspondence which had passed on the subject?

Mr. LOUGH asked whether a Report from the Indian Government had been received with regard to the carpets manufactured in Indian prisons and their distribution in foreign countries. He would also like to know what action he proposed to take in that matter.

Mr. RITCHIE: I do not myself see the slightest objection to laying the correspondence on the Table; but I will enquire about it. I may say, in reply to the hon. member for Islington, that we have received a reply from the Indian Government, and the effect of the reply is that they see no objection to the proposed legislation. (Cheers.)

Mr. LOUGH: Will those papers be published with the others?

Mr. RITCHIE: I will enquire.

THE ADDRESS.
SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S AMENDMENT.
THE RETENTION OF CHITRAL.
"A GRIEVOUS BREACH OF NATIONAL GOOD FAITH."

Sir W. WEDDERBURN moved, as an amendment to the Address, to add the following words at the end: "But we humbly express our regret that the present Government, reversing the policy of their predecessors, have decided not to withdraw from Chitral, thereby violating the pledge expressly given in the Viceroy's proclamation, dangerously adding to Government responsibilities beyond the North-West frontier of India and inevitably leading to an increase of the overgrown expenditure in the Indian Military Department, and further our regret that the Treaty of 1893 with the Amir of Afghanistan has not been placed before Parliament." The hon. baronet said that in the Queen's Speech reference had been made to Chitral in terms expressing approval of the permanent occupation of that territory. He could not allow that to pass without a protest and an appeal to the national conscience against a grievous breach of the national good faith. It might be objected that it was now too late for protest or appeal, but in certain matters it was never too late to mend—it was never too late to remove a blot from the good name of the nation. Some people seemed to think that it was never the right time for Parliament to exercise its duty of control over these frontier aggressions on our weaker neighbours. While the plans were being laid there was profound secrecy, and no one knew anything about them; when the explosion took place we were told it was a crisis, and we must not embarrass the Government; and when Naboth was killed and his vineyard permanently occupied, we were told that it was too late, and no use crying over spilt milk. That might be true; but at any rate, we should do our best to prevent other milk being spilt in the same way. But, as a matter of fact, in the present case circumstances had changed since the decision was come to, and there were reasons to reconsider it. The reasons were contained in the Queen's Speech, which announced that the delimitation of the boundary with Russia had been agreed upon. He congratulated Her Majesty's Government on having accomplished this settlement of the spheres of influence. But this matter being settled in a friendly way, fussy activity on our side of the frontier was no longer called for. It was only likely to act as a challenge to Russia, and stimulate her to forward movements. It had repeatedly been alleged in the Anglo-Indian Press that the real object of the Chitral expedition was to show, with reference to the delimitation negotiations with Russia, that we exercised effective control over Chitral, so that it came within our sphere of influence. If so, these negotiations being now concluded, the retention of Chitral was no longer necessary. He also hoped his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India would explain in what sense the term "Indian Empire" was used in the Queen's Speech with regard to this delimitation. Did it mean that the Government intended to incorporate all these vast mountainous regions, up to the Pamir boundary, in the Indian dominions vested in Her Majesty by the Government of India Act of 1858? This was a question of the greatest financial importance. If it was intended to annex these territories to India, the proper legal steps should be taken, and he desired to know what those steps would be. If the territories were not part of India, the cost of the Chitral expedition must be borne by the Imperial exchequer, unless the assent of both Houses of Parliament was obtained under section 55 of the Act. The grounds of his protest against the retention of Chitral were threefold: 1st. We had broken our pledges to the border tribes; 2nd. The retention was politically dangerous; and 3rd. The cost would be ruinous to the Indian people. In the Queen's Speech the border tribes were congratulated on the loyalty with which they had carried out their engagements. It was a great pity we had not shown a similar loyalty. It seemed a case of *sic vos non vobis*. We no doubt appreciated the advantage of other people keeping their promises to us. But if an ounce of example was better than a pound of precept, it was better than a hundredweight of commendation coming from those who were themselves defaulters. Had anyone any real doubt as to the meaning of Lord Elgin's proclamation? Was the declared object of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

expedition to rescue Dr. Robertson and then retire? Or was it to seize a military post and remain there? The circumstances showed what the meaning was. Our people at Chitral were caught in a trap, 180 miles beyond our frontier. To reach them we had to pass through a mountainous wilderness with rapid torrents, deep defiles, and snowy passes. Without the permission of the tribes we could not get through in time. Accordingly, the following Proclamation was issued: "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn. The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes." Mark the words, "sole object." Nothing is said about roads or valuable military positions. The clear meaning was that we would rescue our people, and then withdraw. He recognised no difference as regards moral principles in public and in private concerns. If he thought a thing wrong to do it alone, it would be wrong if he did it jointly with 30 others, or 30 millions of others. How should we view such a promise if given by an individual? Supposing his house was on fire, and one of his family was in danger of being burnt; and supposing he could not reach this child except by passing though the house of a neighbour, a suspicious man who kept his doors bolted and barred. What would be thought of the man who got permission to pass through his neighbour's house by the promise that he would go back at once, who rescued his child, and then told his neighbour that he meant to stay there, because his prestige, his sense of honour, made it impossible for him to retire when he had once come there? The case was on all fours with that of Chitral. If there was any doubt about the meaning of the Proclamation, let it be submitted to the arbitration of any impartial authority. The right hon. the leader of the House had recommended general arbitration. It was easy to accept arbitration with strong opponents, but it would be more meritorious to accept it with the weak and helpless. Secondly, the permanent occupation of Chitral was dangerous and inexpedient. It was folly to pierce the natural ramparts by which the North-Western frontier was defended, to kill the brave defenders, and to pave the way for a Russian invasion. Also the sheet anchor of our power in India was trust in our good faith, and this trust had now received a grievous blow. Thirdly, the ultimate cost to the people of India would be ruinous. The people of India were miserably poor, and already much over-taxed. No doubt the noble lord would assure the House that the cost would not be great. Such official assurances were made in the Afghan war, which was estimated to cost 1¾ millions, but which cost 21 millions; and in the Abyssinian war which was estimated at 3 millions, and cost 10. He warned the noble lord that in permanently occupying such territories the first steps were the easiest and the cheapest—afterwards came the dangers, the difficulties and the heavy expenditure. He reminded him how Lord Roberts had estimated the fighting population of these mountain regions at a quarter of a million of men, mostly well armed, brave, and with an unconquerable love of independence. These men still occupied the wild regions along the Peshawar-Chitral road, and much money would be needed to coerce or bribe them to accept our presence in their country. As regards the Treaty with the Amír he was glad to hear that the noble lord was willing to lay the text on the Table of the House, but it had not yet been produced. So far as they knew about it, it provided two things: first, to increase by 60 lakhs a year the subsidy paid to the Amír by the unfortunate people of India, and second, to hand over Kafiristan to the Amír. If the subsidy were used to improve the condition of the people of Afghanistan, there would be something to show for it, but he believed that it was chiefly employed to provide arms of precision, and the British nation incurred a responsibility as regarded the use of these arms. At present it was alleged that they were being employed in crushing the Kafirs, a brave and interesting race, and in reviving a local slave trade in the most odious form. This forward frontier policy, this system of aggression on our weaker neighbours, involved the country in dangerous and discreditable transactions, and was absolutely opposed to the policy laid down by Her Gracious Majesty when she assumed direct charge of India, and in her Proclamation of 1858 declared, "We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others."

Mr. SCHWANN seconded the Amendment. He did not see how it was possible for Her Majesty's Government to find any loophole as an excuse for remaining in the territories that they had promised to retire from. Moreover, the whole system of pushing our borders in India was a source of great expense to the revenues of India. The people of India were very poor, their annual income was very small, and their daily earnings were infinitesimal. In order to deal with the difficulties of the finance of India, it had been necessary, as they knew, to place duties on the products of the place he had the honour to represent, and of a large number of manufacturing places in Lancashire and elsewhere. For these reasons, and the more admirable ones given by his hon. friend, he had great pleasure in seconding the motion.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S REPLY.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said the House would recollect that this question of the occupation or the evacuation of Chitral was discussed at some length some time ago, when, by a large majority, approval was expressed of reversing the policy of leaving Chitral. Both the front Opposition bench and other members held that the occupation of Chitral would entail very heavy expenditure, that it would be repugnant to the feelings of the people, and would not tend to promote peace with Russia. Although they did not wish to deny that there was a certain amount of risk, as there always must be in a movement of this kind, they believed it was a danger they ought to face, and face boldly. The most sanguine anticipations that any one could have indulged in had been more than realised. (Hear, hear.) So far from their occupation being regarded in a hostile spirit by the people of the country, on the contrary, they welcomed the English occupation, because it had inaugurated a period of security which they had not known before. (Hear, hear.) Reference had been made to slavery, but before they went there perhaps the very worst form of slavery prevailed. The result of their occupation was that the slave trade had ceased. Before they went there women of the poorer class were abducted; and so far as Chitral was concerned, during the few months they had occupied it that occupation, he believed, had given almost universal satisfaction. Then, Chitral was a much richer country than was anticipated. Irrigation works hundreds of years old were found, and the facilities were such as to enable them to supply the large amount of food necessary for maintaining the garrison. So far, therefore, as Chitral was concerned, the occupation had been an unmixed success. The hon. member went on to say that Indian finance would not carry this expenditure. He thought the expenditure would be less than was anticipated, and, so far from Indian finance being in a critical condition, they must bear in mind that there had been a considerable remission of taxation by the reduction in the cotton duties. He thought they would find, as he stated, last year, that, notwithstanding the Chitral expedition, the equalisation of income and expenditure would be equitably realised. What did the hon. gentleman want them to do? He wanted them to retire from Chitral, and hand it over to anarchy. They could not do that. They were bound within their sphere to prevent disorder, and, if they did not preserve law and order, would that not be an invitation to some other country to come in and perform the duties which they had abdicated? Then the hon. member went on to say that the occupation of Chitral gave offence to Russia. That was a statement and a policy against which he uttered a strong protest. Those who advocated it put into the mouths of foreign Powers and peoples arguments and ideas which neither these Governments nor these peoples would ever have thought of. (Cheers.) Why should Russia object to the occupation of Chitral? Russia had honourably fulfilled every engagement into which she had entered so far as the Indian empire was concerned, and she would no more think of interfering with Chitral than of interfering with any other territory on the English side of the line. He, therefore, objected to that being attributed to Russia which the Russian Government never thought of. Then they were reminded of the country intervening between Chitral and Peshawar. The Government had succeeded in making an excellent road from Peshawar to Chitral, and the tribes through whose territory it had passed had of their own accord undertaken to protect it. The result was that commerce had largely

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized by BA Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

increased. The number of animals and caravans passing through that country had immensely increased, and, moreover, the country was by no means so poor as was supposed. On the contrary, it was evident that many hundreds of years ago it was much more thickly populated than it was now, and there were many signs of returning prosperity. It was, therefore, in the interest both of the intervening tribes as well as of the Chitralis that the policy this House maintained last year should in no sense be disturbed. (Hear, hear.) The proposer of the amendment had accused the Government deliberately of a breach of faith. Was the hon. gentleman acquainted with the facts of the case? It was perfectly clear, from his speech, that neither he nor the seconder of the amendment had mastered the rudiments of the question. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman said there had been a breach of faith, and that the terms of the Proclamation had not been complied with. That Proclamation was issued by the Indian Government. The Indian Government from first to last said they had adhered to every letter of that Proclamation. The Proclamation was issued to the tribes who lived between the territory of Chitral and Peshawar. Did these tribes say the Proclamation had not been adhered to? Could the hon. gentleman quote any fact in support of such a statement?

Mr. SCHWANN: In the journals.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Which journals?

Mr. SCHWANN: Perhaps the newspapers.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have asked the hon. member for his authority for the serious charge which he has advanced against the Indian Government, and he says, perhaps the newspapers would give me some. (Laughter.)

Mr. SCHWANN: I said that humorously. (Laughter.)

Lord G. HAMILTON said that perhaps the hon. gentleman did not quite realise that that was not a place for humorous amusement. For a member of Parliament to advance against the Indian Government a charge of breach of faith was not a humourous performance. (Cheers.) He assured both the mover and seconder of the Amendment that they were absolutely wrong, and that they did not understand in the least to whom the Proclamation was issued or what its object was. The Proclamation was issued to all the people of Swat and the people of the adjacent territory who did not side with Umra Khan, and Umra Khan was the person against whom we were fighting. The Proclamation merely applied to the territory between Peshawar and Chitral, and it had absolutely nothing to do with the people of Chitral, because our suzerainty and authority were already there asserted. What the Indian Government undertook was that, if they were not opposed in passing through the intervening territory, they would not occupy that territory, or in any way interfere with the independence of people through whose country they were passing. Did either of the hon. gentlemen mean to say that the independence of the tribes had been interfered with or their territory occupied? Did they mean to say that any chief of any tribe, or any considerable number of any tribe, had protested against the action of the Indian Government? He would tell the hon. gentlemen exactly what had occurred. There had been a difference between the Indian Government and the tribes as regarded the Proclamation, but only in one sense. The heads of the tribes petitioned the Political Officer asking to be incorporated in British territory. (Laughter and cheers.) They said they had felt such advantage and sense of security from the presence of the troops, and no doubt from the better prices they got for their produce, that they thought they would like to have these benefits permanently. They were told it was impossible they could be so incorporated. Then they wished to go on a mission to the Viceroy at Simla, in order that he might reconsider the decision which had just been conveyed to them. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, he hoped the House would hear no more of charges of bad faith. (Cheers.) The fact was that, unfortunately, the occupation or evacuation of Chitral got into the arena of party conflict at the commencement of the General Election. So soon as that question came to be discussed on its merits it was clear that the case of the present Government as against the late Government was an overwhelmingly strong one; and, therefore, when all the tangible arguments in reference to occupation were annihilated, the supporters of the late Government fell back on breach of faith. It was a pure concoction from beginning to end. There was not a word of truth in it. (Cheers.) It was not based on one iota of fact. He thought that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to reflect that the Viceroy of India, a high-minded gentlemen, was a member of their own party. It was not creditable to English politics that they should bring this charge of want of honour and breach of faith against a member of their own party, who was carrying out a policy which he believed to be consistent with national and Imperial interests. (Cheers.) The result, therefore, of our occupation had been pre-eminently satisfactory, and gentlemen opposite who belonged to the Radical, or Progressive, party, as it was now called, could hardly realise what they were asking the House to do. There was an excellent road made through a country which had previously been unapproachable, which road had led to a large increase of commerce and trade. There were a number of rivers traversed by excellent bridges, and he was informed that parts of the road were as good as an English turnpike road. The road had daily been improved; it had been watched and guarded by local levies, who were paid; and trade was greatly increasing all along the route. Why, now, in the name of common sense, were we to retire and break up this road? Hon. gentlemen appeared not in the position of reformers, but of vandals. (Hear, hear.) Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned, and which would tend to put an end to those periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that portion of Her Majesty's dominions. (Cheers.)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House divided: Ayes, 79; Noes, 193.

February 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PRISON MORTALITY IN INDIA.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would press upon the Indian Government the need for increased endeavours to diminish the still continuing excessive mortality in some of the prisons, especially in Bengal, where it appeared by an official report, dated Calcutta, June 8th, 1895, that in four of the Bengal gaols there were, during the year 1894, more than 100 deaths per 1,000 prisoners, namely, 239 per mille at Chaibass, 144 at Naya Dunka, 129 at Daltonganz, and 118 at Balasore?

Mr. HANBURY: The resolution to which the hon. member refers shows that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is fully alive to his responsibility, and is doing all that lies in his power to prevent a recurrence of the exceptionally high mortality in the four gaols which have been mentioned, the actual number of deaths in which were 29, 9, 5, and 14 respectively, and this mortality was largely due to an outbreak of cholera. This being so, I do not think it necessary to call the attention of the Government of India to the subject, but I will ask for copies of the reports of the committees which have been appointed to investigate the causes of the recent mortality at Chaibass and Balasore.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. T. R. BUCHANAN asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he would lay upon the Table papers and correspondence relating to the agreement respecting Siam recently concluded with France, and would include in them the communications on the subject with the Government of India.

Mr. CURZON: It is proposed to lay on the Table papers and correspondence relating to the recent agreement with regard to Siam.

Mr. E. H. PICKERSGILL asked whether the right hon. gentleman would include a copy of the convention between China and France of the 20th of June, 1895, which was material to the appreciation of the agreement between France and this country.

Mr. CURZON: May I ask hon. friends that where it is possible to help me to give them a proper reply, they would at least give me one day's notice of their questions? (Hear, hear.)

Mr. PICKERSGILL asked whether the right hon. gentleman was not aware that the new agreement between France and this country referred specifically to a convention which was made between China and France on the 20th of June, 1895. It was impossible to appreciate the effect of the agreement without having a copy of that convention.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Is the right hon. gentleman not aware that the papers have already been laid before the French Parliament in the form of a Yellow-book, and that they might be quoted from?

MR. CURZON: No, Sir, I am not aware of it, because it is not a fact. The papers laid before the French Parliament in the form of a Yellow-book are the same papers that have already been published in this country, and they will shortly appear in the shape of a Declaration agreed upon by the two Governments, with the addition of a letter from the Foreign Minister of France to the French Minister for the Colonies. This letter corresponds with a letter from Lord Salisbury to the Marquis of Dufferin.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES asked whether it was not a fact that the agreement had been published in France in the form of a Yellow-book.

MR. CURZON said that was so, but what he said was that no correspondence connected with the agreement had been presented.

MR. BUCHANAN asked whether the right hon. gentleman could lay on the Table the correspondence between the Home and Indian Governments, as Lord Salisbury had stated in the House of Lords that the Government of India had given its assent to the arrangement that had been made.

MR. CURZON said it was not usual to lay on the Table of the House such correspondence as that referred to between the two Governments. He hoped, however, to have an opportunity of speaking about this agreement, and he should then be ready to give the hon. member and the House all information possible as to the attitude of the Indian Government on the matter.

MR. PICKERSGILL asked what objection there was to laying a copy of the convention on the Table of the House.

MR. CURZON said there was no objection whatever to doing so, and it would shortly appear before the House in the Treaty Series.

February 20th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

APPEAL COURT OF BENGAL.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY had the following question on the paper: To ask the Under Secretary of State for India what steps have been taken to bring the practice of the Appeal Court of Bengal into harmony with the law and the practice of the Appeal Court of the Madras Presidency, by directing the Appeal Court of Bengal to communicate to a lower court the fact of its having reversed a sentence of the lower court, so as to prevent the abuse now existing in cases of persons who have been subject to a criminal charge, and fined by a lower court, and who have obtained a reversal of such sentence from the Appeal Court, of being subjected to some months' delay, and to the payment of additional stamps, in order to recover the amount of fines wrongfully paid by them. He said that he had reason to believe that the ground of the complaint to which the question referred had now been removed. He desired to tender his thanks to the present Secretary of State for India and his predecessor for the steps which they had taken in the matter.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I am not aware what authority the noble lord has for the suggestion that the practice of the High Court of Bengal is not in harmony with the law. I believe it to be a universal rule throughout India that all orders passed in appeal shall be forthwith certified to the court below. When, therefore, the refund of a fine has been ordered, there ought to be no difficulty in obtaining repayment from the Treasury. Instructions were sent to India some time ago to make enquiries as to the practice obtaining in the various provinces, and to pass such orders as might be found necessary to secure prompt relief in such cases. The Government of India issued a circular on the subject in June last, and the Secretary of State expects to receive their final report shortly.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could state the number, or approximate number, of hand-loom weavers in India:

And, when he proposed to lay upon the Table of the House the Correspondence which had taken place with the Government of India on the Cotton Duties since the last Papers were laid upon the Table.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no returns of the precise number of hand-loom weavers in India. The Census of 1891 showed for all India including Native States 1,873,980 households of the weaver caste. This is a large reduction as compared with the previous return of 1881. This evidence of the falling off in the hand industry is confirmed by the fact that of recent years the weaving mills of India have steadily increased their out-turn, while the area of cotton cultivation has remained stationary.

As soon as I receive copies of the recent Acts and the discussions thereon I shall be glad to lay papers on the Table.

THE INDIAN MINTS.

SIR W. HOULDSWORTH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether Her Majesty's Government had refused to co-operate with Germany in furthering an international monetary agreement by reopening the mints in India.

MR. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend I have to say there is no truth in the report mentioned by him. The Government of this country has not been approached by Germany on the subject of an international monetary agreement. We should be willing to consider, in conjunction with the Indian Government, the reopening of the mints in India if such a measure could be made part of a satisfactory scheme of currency reform.

KAFIRISTAN.

SIR ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information as to the losses of the inhabitants of Kafiristan during the recent invasion by the forces of the Amir:

And whether, if the military operations were renewed, Her Majesty's Government would arrange for a British officer to accompany the Afghan troops.

LORD G. HAMILTON: According to latest information received from the Government of India, the Kafirs were being disarmed and the property of those who had fled was being confiscated; but both the persons and property of those who remained were safe. No repressive measures are reported. About 150 Kafirs have sought refuge in Chitral. The Afghan troops under the Sipah Salar have withdrawn, and military operations are reported to be practically terminated. The Government of India have desired that telegraphic reports be sent to them from Chitral of any further operations.

It would not be possible to make arrangements by which a British officer should accompany any subsequent Afghan expedition.

February 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India Council (re-appointment of Sir Donald Stewart). Copy presented of Minute by the Secretary of State for India extending the term of Field Marshal Sir Donald Stewart's office as Member of the Council of India, under Act 32 and 33 Vic., c. 97, s. 3 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

OPERATIONS IN THE PERSIAN GULF.

SIR CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state to the House the reason for the operations conducted during last year in the Persian Gulf by Her Majesty's ships "Sphinx" and "Pigeon."

LORD G. HAMILTON: In consequence of quarrels between the Sheikh of Bahrein, who is under the suzerainty of Her Majesty, and other local sheikhs, the chief of the Ali-bin-Ali, apparently supported by the Turks, established himself on the mainland at Zobara, opposite Bahrein, and about 200 dhows assembled there to attack Bahrein.

In order to maintain the maritime peace to which the tribes are pledged, Commander Pelly of the "Sphinx" was authorised to resist this demonstration, provided he was satisfied that the dhows were assembled with a hostile purpose, and to liberate the Bahrein boats which had been forcibly detained.

As the dhows, after due warning, refused to disperse, they were attacked on the 6th September, and forty-four were destroyed. On the following day terms were arranged, and the peace of the Gulf re-established.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 2. APRIL, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 24th to March 24th.

Imperial Parliament.

February 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. YERBURGH asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of Article VI. of the Franco-Chinese Convention of 20th June, 1895, the Government of India would take steps for the connexion of their telegraph system with that of China at Isumao, that of Siam at Kiang Hsen, and that of French Indo-China in the region of the Upper Mekong:

Whether, in view of the Anglo-French Agreement of 15th January last, which, by guaranteeing the independence of the portion of Siam through which the route of the projected Burma-Siam China Railway runs, had removed all political obstacles to the construction of the said railway through Siam, the Government of India would enter into arrangements with the Government of Siam for the execution out of Government revenue of such surveys and estimates by railway engineers of the sections of the said projected railway lying within their respective territories as were necessary for placing the line upon the market, or for the construction of the portions of the railway lying in their respective territories by the Governments concerned:

And whether, in view of the French railway projects for tapping the trade of South-Western China at Isumao, the Government of India would have explorations conducted and surveys made of the most feasible routes for connecting the Burmese seaport of Rangoon with Isumao, so that the best route for a railway might be selected, and whether it would, on the completion of such surveys and explorations, either itself undertake the construction of the said railway or facilitate its construction by private enterprise.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no information of an intention on the part of the Government of India to extend their Burmese telegraph system beyond its present terminus at Kieng Tung in the directions indicated in my hon. friend's question.

The Government of India has not expressed any intention of entering into arrangements for construction of the lines of railway suggested in the second and third paragraphs of the question. Without entering into any discussion of the matters suggested by the form of my hon. friend's question, I may observe that until the Kunlong ferry line is completed, and the Siam Government has had time to consider its railway policy, any serious discussion of a Burma-Siam China line to Sumao appears to me premature.

ARMY PENSIONS.

Mr. M. MCCARTAN asked the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the case of a pensioner named Edward Kenney, now residing in Poitiers, France, who, having served twenty-one years and eight months in the Worcestershire Regiment, including active service in the Indian Mutiny and a long service in the Colonies, was discharged on life pension in October, 1878, whether he had been refused continuance of his pension because he was residing in France? And whether he would make enquiry into the matter, with the view of having his pension continued to him now in his old age.

Mr. BRODRICK: This man has not been refused his pension, though it appears that he has not applied for the amount due last quarter. As he is over fifty years of age, residence abroad does not disqualify him for its receipt. He should apply in the usual course to his paymaster.

Mr. T. W. LEGH asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether any compensation would be given to the mother of Lieutenant Wroughton, who lost his life in the collision between French and English troops at Waima, West Africa, on 23rd December, 1893; and if it was the case that the recipient of a pension from the India Office was thereby rendered ineligible for the receipt of any pension or compensation from army funds.

Mr. BRODRICK: As Mrs. Wroughton is already in receipt of a pension as the widow of an officer she is ineligible for any pension for the loss of her son. She appears to be further disqualified by not having been mainly dependent upon her son for support. It is not the case that the recipient of a pension from the India Office would necessarily be ineligible for a pension from army funds.

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. J. H. ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India:

1. If his attention had been called to the charges brought by the Political Agent at Jhalawar against the Máhárája Rana of that State, accompanied with a recommendation to the Viceroy for his deposition; if so, what action had been taken by the Government of India with regard to these charges;

2. Would His Highness have every opportunity afforded to him to defend himself publicly from these charges before any definite action was taken with regard to the recommendation for his deposition;

3. And would the Secretary of State lay upon the Table of the House any papers and correspondence relating to this difficulty in Jhalawar.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My answer to the first part of the first question is in the affirmative, and to the second part, that the reports of the Political Agent as to the oppression existing have been examined on the spot by the newly-appointed Agent

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

to the Governor-General, whose report is under the consideration of Lord Elgin.

The Máhárája Rana will be allowed every opportunity of submitting his reply to these charges.

As soon as I have received the final decision of the Viceroy I will consider if papers relating to this subject can be laid upon the Table of the House.

February 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. R. A. YERBURGH asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, what action had been taken by the Government towards an agreement with China in order that Article IV of the Anglo-French Agreement of 15th January last relating to China, Siam, and the Mekong should not be ineffective; whether Article III of the said Anglo-French Agreement was held by Her Majesty's Government to imply that notwithstanding China's breach of Article V of the Burmo-Chinese Boundary Convention in ceding portions of the Shan State of Kian Hung to France without our permission, the remaining portions of that State were not to be reclaimed by us from China; what action had been taken by the Government for preserving our right of railway approach from our Burmese seaboard to Ssumao and for acquiring the right from China of prolonging our present projected railway across the Chinese border into China, on the same terms as had been granted by China to France in the case of present projected French railways under Article V of the Franco-Chinese Commercial Convention of 20th June, 1895; and whether Ssumao having been declared open as a treaty port by the aforesaid Franco-Chinese Convention, and a French Consul having been appointed to it, the Government would, in the exercise of their rights under the most favoured Nation Clauses of our Treaties with China, appoint a British Consul to this important emporium of trade?

Mr. GEORGE CURZON: The matters alluded to by the hon. member are at the present moment the subject of negotiations with the Chinese Government, and I am not in a position therefore to make any statement about them. As regards paragraph 2 of the question, no such inference is necessarily to be drawn.

THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE.
HOW THEY AFFECT INDIA.

In the course of the debate on the new rules of procedure,

Dr. CLARK said: There was one great question which they could not enter into as far as he was concerned. They had home affairs, foreign affairs, and colonial affairs, but they had no estimates for India. Indian affairs could not be discussed except on a motion to leave the chair on Friday night. The result of previous attempts to take away the time of private members was to compel them to move the adjournment of the House or to bring the matters forward on the Address, and that was why in the last few years—for eight or ten years—the debate on the Address had been spun out. If they could not bring it forward in one way they would in another. So it would be again. They could always make sure of forty members, so that instead of bringing a subject up in a regular form they were driven to moving the adjournment of the House. He contended that this irregular procedure would waste more time than if a subject was brought forward in the proper manner.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said he should like to utter a few words on behalf of the most oppressed minority in the House—the minority consisting of members who occupied themselves about Indian questions. He should like to ask the leader of the House what he was able to do for that group of members? At present they had lost their Fridays, but nothing whatever had been given to them instead. The leader of the House had promised to some of these members that they would have better opportunities in Supply of bringing forward grievances but as to Indian questions not a single item of Indian Expenditure appeared upon the Imperial Estimates. Therefore, there would be no opportunities for bringing forward Indian grievances. He must point out that those members who had to support the cause of India really required the fullest indulgence of that House. They had no voters behind them He thought he might say that in bringing forward Indian grievances any hon. member had a difficulty and a danger to confront. The subjects were even distasteful to the House. Anyone who brought an Indian subject forward was likely to be regarded as a bore, and that was a danger at which the stoutest heart might quail. The one really valuable weapon was the power of making objection upon the Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER said the hon. member was now going beyond the amendment.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN claimed that if Fridays were to be taken away some equivalent should be given. The way he would suggest was that the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be brought on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not entitled to ask that Indian finance should be dealt with differently from the way in which it is now dealt with.

February 27th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SUNDAY WORK IN INDIAN MILLS.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in a number of Indian jute mills cleaning and repairs of machinery were carried on regularly on Sundays, but that in several mills the engines were stopped on Saturday afternoons for cleaning and repairs to be done, so that the gates were not opened on Sundays; and whether, apart from any legal question under the Indian Factories Acts, he would recommend the Government of India to use its influence in favour of the entire stoppage of work in the mills on Sundays, except in the case of serious accidents or other emergencies.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no information regarding the number of jute mills at which machinery is cleaned on Sundays. The Indian Factory Act specifically permits the examining and repairing of machinery on Sundays. Moreover, while the Act enforces one holiday a week, it permits the holiday to be on some other day than Sunday; and, according to the table published in the last "Moral and Material Progress Report," 81 of the inspected factories had their holiday on some other day of the week.

MORTALITY IN BENGAL PRISONS.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India, inasmuch as the most recent official returns from Bengal showed that during the past five years, out of a daily average of 17,945 prisoners in the gaols of that Presidency there were 1,169 deaths, of which only 207 were from cholera, would the Government endeavour more effectually to secure the introduction into the generality of Bengal prisons of those special sanitary improvements which had lately been eminently successful at the Hugli District Gaol and also at Bhagalpur, where deaths from dysentry and other malarial diseases had, in consequence, been reduced to a minimum.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The hon. member has quoted figures which apply not to the last five years, but the fifty-one years from 1844 to 1894. The corresponding figures for the last five years would be 16,576, 622 and 51. The average death-rate per mille of average strength in those five years was only 37, a rate so low that it goes far to confirm the statement which I made last week, that the Lieutenant-Governor is doing all that lies in his power to make the gaols more healthy. I am not aware what are the special sanitary improvements to which the question refers; but I will, however, cause the question to be brought under the notice of the Lieutenant-Governor.

HEALTH OF EUROPEAN TROOPS.

Mr. CALDWELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the prevalence of enteric fever amongst the European troops in India:

And whether he would cause enquiry to be made as to the disposal of the night soil and manure collected in the bazaars and districts of the various cantonments where such enteric fever exists, and in particular as to the size and extent of the [illegible] and how far the night soil and manure were buried, and the seasonal cultivation of the land neglected.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The subject of the prevalence of enteric fever among the British troops in India was considered by a Special Committee in India a few years ago, and the Government of India are fully alive to the importance of taking all sanitary precautions, including those referred to in the second paragraph of the question, to check this disease. The subject is one which is constantly engaging their attention.

THE ROYAL ENGINEERS.

Sir BEVAN EDWARDS asked the Secretary of State for India whether it had been brought to his notice that the Indian Government had refused to employ several lieutenant-colonels of the Royal Engineers who had lately been sent to India by the War Office:

And could he state what steps he proposed to take to ensure that those officers should be employed.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Difficulties have arisen in finding suitable employment in India for the senior officers of the Royal Engineers whom the Indian Government, in accordance with their agreement with the War Office, retain upon the Indian establishments.

This question, which presses for settlement, is now under consideration.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Dr. TANNER asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether there had been any falling-off of candidates for commissions in the Army Medical Department; if so, what was considered the cause; whether the same result occurred in connexion with candidates for the Indian Medical Service; and what were the numbers presenting themselves for examination in those services respectively for the past three years.

Dr. KENNY asked the Under Secretary of State for War whether, at last examination for candidates for the Army Medical Service, there were more vacancies than candidates; whether there were at present at the Irish medical schools any intending candidates for the Army Medical Service; and had he any information showing to what causes the falling-off in candidates was attributable, especially of candidates from the Irish schools, for a service hitherto so popular.

Mr. BRODRICK: The question has been also brought to the notice of Lord Lansdowne by the learned member for Dublin University. In proportion to the vacancies offered for competition there was a falling-off in the number of candidates in 1895 as compared with 1893 and 1894. The same result occurred, though in a less degree, for the Indian Medical Service. The candidates during the last three years have been: for the Army Medical Staff, 59 for 26 vacancies, 51 for 22 vacancies, and 40 for 27 vacancies; for the Indian Medical Service, 63 for 27 vacancies, 69 for 28 vacancies, and 70 for 34 vacancies. At the last examination for the Army Medical Staff 18 candidates competed for 17 vacancies. The causes of this diminution, especially in the number of Irish candidates, are engaging the serious consideration of the Secretary of State, and I hope to be in a position to make a statement upon the subject in introducing the Army Estimates.

Dr. KENNY suggested that the falling-off of Irish candidates was due to the fact that there were no representatives of Irish medical schools on the examining board for either the Indian Medical Service or the Army Medical Service.

Dr. TANNER also asked for the cause of this "boycotting" of the services by young medical men from Ireland.

Mr. BRODRICK said the matter should be investigated.

TELEGRAMS TO INDIA.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether, in view of the restrictive effect of the present high tariff for telegraphic messages between the United Kingdom and India, he would favourably consider the proposal of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce that the charge should be reduced from five francs to three francs per word, and endeavour to give effect to the recommendation at the forthcoming International Telegraph Conference.

Mr. R. W. HANBURY: The Postmaster-General cannot find that such a proposal has reached him from the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, and he thinks it is more likely to have been addressed to the Government of India, which is directly concerned in the matter. He has, however, received representations on behalf of the merchants and others in this country who use the telegraph to India and he is in communication with the cable companies on the subject.

February 28th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

ARMY SERVICE IN INDIA.

Lord MONKSWELL rose to call attention to the practice of sending band-boys to India at the age of fifteen; and to move: "That a humble address be presented for a return of the number of persons enlisted in the army as boys who have been sent to India under the age of twenty during the last five years, giving the names, ages, and medical records of such of them as have died or been discharged invalided from the service, and the pensions granted to the latter." He said that the class on whose behalf he proposed to address a few words to their lordships was not a large or influential one, but he thought their case was worthy of attention. His attention was first called to the matter in the course of his duties as a Commissioner of Chelsea Hospital. The Commissioners met once a week to go through the list of soldiers discharged invalided from the army, with a view to deciding whether or not they were entitled to pensions. In going through these lists he observed cases of lads of seventeen or eighteen discharged invalided after service in India. He thought that a very shocking state of things, and at his request another Commissioner, a general officer, promised to look into the matter and report. He met his gallant friend on several subsequent occasions, and he always said he had the matter under consideration. The late Government went out in rather a hurry, and his gallant friend did not report to him, but as he implored him not to drop the matter, he had thought that he would have reported to the noble marquis opposite. Some months ago he had a conversation with the noble marquis on the subject. The noble marquis met him in a very sympathetic and friendly spirit, and said he was obliged to him for bringing the matter to his attention, and promised to enquire into it. He heard no more, and a few days ago he wrote to ask what had been done. The noble marquis very candidly replied that the matter had entirely escaped his memory, and went on to say that the War Office had determined to make no alteration. In office and out of office he had tried to press the matter forward, but had miserably failed. His only course, therefore, was to bring the matter before their lordship's House. It might be that the noble marquis would tell him that these boys when they arrived in India were sent to hill stations. He was aware that that was the theory, but he was assured on high military authority that the practice did not conform with the theory. The colonel of the regiment did not like to break up his band, and was under great temptations to encourage these boys to remain in the plains. He would sometimes go round and say: "You are quite well, my lad, are you not? It will not do you any harm to remain here;" and the boy being pleased by the notice taken of him by his commanding officer, made no objection, and in many cases he remained, and, in the words of a distinguished officer, "the poor boy blows and blows till he can blow no longer." He ventured to put forward a general proposition which he was sure would have the unanimous assent of their lordships and of the Secretary of State for War. It was this, that except in cases of necessity it was wrong for them to inflict on the children of other people dangers to health to which they would not on any account subject their own children. The noble marquis could make out no case of necessity for sending these boys to India, and he hoped the Secretary of State would at least promise him to look most carefully into this matter. He ventured even to express the hope that he would go a little further, and would be able to tell the House that he had come to the conclusion that some considerable alteration ought to be made as to the age at which boys were liable to be sent to India. He begged to move the motion which stood in his name.

The MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE: I must begin by pleading guilty to the act of forgetfulness the noble lord imputes to me. If I did lose sight of the wish he expressed, that wish was conveyed to me at a time when both of us were somewhat hurried and it is only natural that his words should not have fixed

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

themselves as firmly as they might have done on my attention. As regards the attitude of the War Office, I think the noble lord will not complain if, considering the enormous attempts he seems to have made to obtain a change of policy in regard to this question, during the short time I have been connected with the department, I should not have taken the question up. I find it to be the case that these band boys have for a very long time past been sent to India at the age of fifteen. The question seems to have been under consideration more than once, but those in authority have never been satisfied that there was any sufficient cause for making a change. On one occasion, indeed, a proposal was put forward to reduce the age limit and to send out those boys at the age of fourteen, but that proposal was not accepted. I should have said at first that there are about 600 of these boys altogether in India at the present time, who went out to India at fifteen years of age. It may be argued that as we avoid sending soldiers to India until they are past the age of twenty, *a fortiori* it is a very wrong thing to send lads of fifteen to that country. That is a view of the case which at first commended itself very strongly to me, but I am assured, on what I know to be good authority, that the facts do not entirely support these arguments. I am told by those who have a right to form an opinion, that growing lads of fifteen are less liable to take harm from the effects of the Indian climate, and particularly from those diseases which are prevalent in that country, than men five or six years older; and the only statistics which I have been able to obtain since the noble lord put his question on the paper, certainly bear out that view, because I find that taking the ten years, ending 1894, there were 9·55 deaths per thousand amongst men under twenty, whereas there were no less than 17·28 deaths per thousand among men between twenty and twenty-five, and taking invaliding, the rate per thousand for men under twenty was 10·55, and for men between twenty and twenty-five, 26·57. These figures certainly at first sight seem to bear out the view I have expressed just now, and I think it will be obvious to the noble lord, that there are certain reasons for which we might expect that these lads would probably suffer less from the climate than youths of a greater age; because these band boys are certainly very much less exposed to extreme fatigue and great heat than the regular soldiers. For instance, they escape altogether, I believe, duty as sentries—a very trying duty, as we all know, in hot climates. The noble lord has moved for a return showing the number of persons enlisted as boys, their names, ages, and medical records. I have no wish whatever to keep back anything from the noble lord, but I am told this return would take considerable time to prepare, that we should have to refer to every battalion, the records of each would have to be searched and the information would be very far from easy to obtain. I hope, therefore, the noble lord will not press his motion for their return, but will be content with the assurance I give him that I will have the matter very carefully looked into—particularly if he will assist me by communicating to me privately the authorities upon whom he relies for his statement—and let him know the result as soon as I have anything to communicate.

Lord MONKSWELL: I should like to ask the noble Marquis whether the statistics he has given include combatants?

The MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE: As no soldiers are allowed to go to India until they are past twenty, it is obvious that the greater number of men returned below twenty must be these band boys.

Lord MONKSWELL: Do the figures include those killed in action?

The MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE: Yes.

Lord MONKSWELL thought that the view taken by the noble marquis was a little startling, because they all knew that it was dangerous to their health to send young men under twenty to India. The noble marquis said that about 9½ per thousand of those under twenty died. That was a large percentage, but it was impossible to say, unless the noble marquis produced statistics a little more in detail, how it came to pass that the enormous number of 17½ per thousand died between the ages of twenty and twenty-five. There might be other reasons for that, which he would not go into now, besides the fact that some others were probably killed in action. The noble marquis knew that in England it was a very rare thing for a boy between fifteen and twenty to die. He understood that at Eton the deathrate was one in 2,000, and in industrial schools with which he was connected the death rate was certainly not more than 2 in 1,000. A death rate, therefore, of 9½ in the 1,000 was very high. The statistics of the noble marquis really proved too much, because if he was right the moment a young recruit was enlisted they ought to send him out to India.

The EARL OF WEMYSS hoped the Secretary of State for War would also give his attention to the question of the service of immature boys in the army. Was it right or desirable that they should have served in the army and be reckoned as efficient soldier-boys under twenty years of age? He did not think that youths of seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen, ought to be borne on the army estimates or reckoned as efficient soldiers.

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN MINTS.

Sir WILLIAM CORBINGTON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he could give any information as to the tenour of the communications which had passed between Her Majesty's Government and that of Germany with reference to the re-opening of the Indian mints; and whether any change had taken place in the views of Her Majesty's Government since the date of those communications.

Mr. CURZON: On November 8th Count Hatzfeldt enquired whether Her Majesty's Government were willing to discuss the bi-metallic question in conference, in the event of the German Government deciding to do so. Lord Salisbury replied that he must consult his colleagues before expressing a definite opinion; but that he did not wish to exclude the idea of a conference if good grounds for holding it were shown. In a subsequent conversation, Count Hatzfeldt enquired whether the Indian Government proposed to re-open their mints, as the German Government considered this a necessary condition of any international arrangement. On December 6th he was informed that the re-opening of the Indian mints was not contemplated either by the Government of India or by Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council. This being the case, the subject was not then pursued further. At a later date Count Hatzfeldt showed to Lord Salisbury the statement which the German Chancellor proposed to make in the Reichstag as to what had passed between them. Lord Salisbury made no objection to the statement, but with reference to observations made in the Reichstag he reminded Count Hatzfeldt that his reply had been confined to a statement of the facts as they then were, and had not been intended to imply any intention, one way or the other, for the future. The statement made by the First Lord on February 20th indicates the general views which Her Majesty's Government, after consideration, entertain upon the subject.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. C. E. SCHWANN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when he would be able to lay upon the Table of the House the papers with reference to Siam, and the negotiations prior to the signing of the Anglo-French Convention, as well as a copy of the treaty itself.

Mr. CURZON: The Anglo-French Declaration about Siam will be laid next week, with a copy of the despatch to Lord Dufferin which has already appeared in the *Gazette*. As I have before stated, it is not proposed to lay papers relative to the previous negotiation.

March 2nd.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE OCCUPATION OF CHITRAL.

Lord REAY asked the Under Secretary for India whether any further papers would be presented to Parliament referring to the final settlement made with Chitral; to any arrangements entered into with the tribes through whose territories the road from Hardwar to Chitral was made; stating the expenditure on the road and the estimated annual expenditure on the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

military posts entailed by the construction of this road; and the estimated annual expenditure on the occupation of Chitral.

The Earl of Onslow: Papers showing the final settlement with Chitral and the tribal agreements are in the press for presentation to Parliament. The additional annual military expenditure upon the occupation of Chitral and upon the line of communication will be shown in one of the despatches included in the return. (Hear, hear.)

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

Lord Reay asked the Under Secretary for India whether the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Government of India relating to the alteration in the import and excise duties on cotton, the memorials addressed to the Government of India by the Indian Chambers of Commerce and the Indian Millowners' Associations, would be included in the papers which were to be laid on the Table by the Secretary of State.

The Earl of Onslow: The correspondence with the Government of India and the memorials, so far as they have reached the Secretary of State for India, will be included in the Cotton Duties Papers to be laid on the Table. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Opium). Copy presented of Correspondence regarding the Report by the Royal Commission on Opium [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIAN FORCES BEYOND THE FRONTIERS.

Mr. Buchanan asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the 24th Bombay Native Infantry, or other force had been ordered to proceed to British East Africa to engage in military operations:

And, whether, as this was an employment of the Indian forces in military operations beyond the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, he intended at an early date, to submit a motion to the House in accordance with the 55th section of the Government of India Act.

Lord George Hamilton: My answer to the first question is in the affirmative.

As regards the section of the Act referred to in the second question, I am advised that its restriction is purely financial, viz., that the revenues of India shall not, without the assent of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operations carried on beyond the frontiers of India by Her Majesty's forces charged upon Indian revenues.

I am in communication with the Foreign Office and Treasury as to how the expenditure in connexion with this regiment is to be met, and, until this question is settled, I cannot say if it will be necessary under the section to submit any motion to the House.

Sir C. Dilke: Can the noble lord say to whom this regiment is lent, and if to the Zanzibar Government, can he say whether he has made any stipulation on behalf of India with regard to the command of the force of which it forms part, in fact, under whose direction it is to be?

Lord G. Hamilton: It will be under the command of its colonel, who will precede the officers at present in charge.

Mr. Buchanan: If the Secretary of State determines that any part of the expense shall be borne by India, will a resolution be submitted to the House?

Lord G. Hamilton: I will take care that the section is not infringed.

THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table any correspondence with the Government of India in reference to opium, arising out of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Opium.

Lord George Hamilton: The correspondence to which the hon. member alludes will be laid upon the Table to-day.

MORTALITY IN BENGAL PRISONS.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table the report as to the excessive death-rate in Bengal prisons, and the other papers connected with the enquiry some two years ago:

And why the Administrative Report of the Gaols of Bengal, printed at the Bengal Secretariat Press, was marked as not printed for sale, and was not purchaseable as similar reports were in this country.

Lord George Hamilton: I am not aware that there has been any single report on the subject referred to. The Government of India's Proceedings contain several voluminous reports upon certain gaols, in which a heavy mortality had been observed; but the papers are obviously incomplete. I will make enquiries, and let the hon. member know in due course what papers can be presented upon his making the usual motion.

I will also enquire whether the Administration Report may not be offered for sale after it has been reviewed by the Lieutenant-Governor. The Government resolution, I observe, has been published in the official *Gazette*, and it seems to contain all the material facts.

POPPY CULTIVATION.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state what was the quantity of land under poppy cultivation this year in the Behar and Benares Agencies, respectively, as compared with the years 1893-4 and 1894-5.

Lord George Hamilton: Information regarding the area under poppy cultivation during the present season, the spring of 1896, has not yet reached me.

POST CARDS.

Mr. Henniker Heaton asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General,

1. Whether he was aware that the Government of India sells post cards at their face value.
2. Whether those post cards were printed in England by the same firm that prints British post cards.
3. What would be the estimated loss to the Government by selling thin halfpenny post cards at their face value, in place of selling them at three farthings each; and,
4. Whether the Government take into consideration the claims of the stationers when selling penny post cards at their face value?

Mr. Hanbury: It is understood that the Government of India sells post cards at their face value. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. At the present rate of issue the loss would be £6,500 a year. As regards the last paragraph, the sale of these cards is not so large as to materially affect the interests of stationers.

March 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIAM.

Mr. E. R. P. Moon asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, at any point or points south of the Nam-Huok River, the western frontier (including the 25 kil. zone) of French Indo-China, was, by the Convention of 15th January, made conterminous with the eastern frontier of the neutralised portion of Siam; and, if so, when and how it was proposed to delimit accurately the region indicated vaguely in Article 1 of the said Convention as comprised: (*a*) in the basins of certain rivers; (*b*) a strip of coast with the river basins thereof; and (*c*) a further vaguely-indicated territory in the north-east of Siam.

Mr. Curzon: The 25 kil. zone is not, as the question implies, included within the western frontier of French Indo-China. It lies outside of the latter, and remains Siamese territory, subject to certain stipulations under the Franco-Siamese Treaty of October, 1893. A map of the Siamese dominions, indicating that part of them which has been guaranteed by the recent agreement between England and France, will be laid with the papers this week. It has not so far been thought necessary to proceed with more exact delimitation.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for Indi whether in view of the distinguished services of the India

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Staff Corps, and the fact that the Artillery, Engineers, and Marines, as well as the Indian Naval Squadron were styled "Royal," the Government would consider the propriety of praying Her Majesty the Queen to graciously order that the designation of "Royal" or "Imperial" should be prefixed to the title of the "Indian Staff Corps."

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am not aware that there is any general desire on the part of the officers of the Indian Staff Corps for a change of designation of their service.

I should be reluctant to move in the matter until I have a recommendation on the subject from the Government of India.

THE IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to observations made in a paper read by Sir J. B. Lyall, lately Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, at the Society of Arts on 13th February, on the high scientific and economic value of the work performed by the officers of the Indian Irrigation Department, its responsible and risky nature, and the exceptional hardships involved in living in insalubrious out stations where bread and decent food were not procurable, the unpopularity of the service, and the discontent among the executive and assistant-engineers in it:

Whether, when Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, with Colonel Ottley as Chief Engineer, Sir J. B. Lyall proposed to the Government of India that, as partial compensation to these officers for the exceptional conditions above summarised, superior pay, in the form of out-station allowances, should be granted to these engineers;

Whether the proposal was approved by the Indian Government:

And, whether any information of the proposal, and the grounds of disapproval, had been received at the India Office; and, if not whether he would call for a report on the subject from the Viceregal Government.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The statements in Sir J. B. Lyall's interesting paper referred to by the honourable member have been brought to my notice. It is the case that a recommendation was made by Sir J. B. Lyall, when Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, to the Government of India for the grant of "jungle or out-station allowances" to certain engineers of the Irrigation Department. This recommendation was not, however, accepted by the Government of India, on the ground that the circumstances of the officers in question did not differ widely, if at all, from those of officers of the Public Works and other Departments in other parts of India who were stationed in outlying or solitary districts.

I see no reason for interfering with the discretion of the Government of India in this matter.

MILITARY AND PUBLIC WORKS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would consent to grant as unopposed Returns the papers mentioned in that day's Notices of Motions standing under the heads of "East India (Pensions)" and "East India (Establishment Charges and Percentages in the Military Works and Public Works Departments)".

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As regards the report of the Committee on the Military Works and Public Works Departments, no expression of opinion on it has been received from the Government of India, nor has it been considered by the Secretary of State in Council. Until this has been done, I cannot undertake to say whether it can be laid on the Table.

KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether information had been received by Her Majesty's Government as to the disposal of the people in the portion of Kafiristan taken possession of by the Afghans prior to the cessation of hostilities on 24th January last, and the removal to Chitral of those who wished to leave the conquered country:

Whether Her Majesty's Government would make arrangements with the Amír of Afghanistan for the safe conduct of these and any other expatriated Kafirs into districts where they could be suitably provided for, and would see that such provision was made:

Whether, as there does not appear to be accommodation in Chitral for any large number of Kafir settlers, Her Majesty's Government would consider the expediency of locating the exiles in Kashmir or some other district less crowded and affording better facilities for peaceable residence than Chitral:

And whether, if the complete occupation of Kafiristan by the Afghans was inevitable, Her Majesty's Government would use its influence to secure the adoption of a policy not less humane than that which, as reported in the *Times* of 21st February, had been insisted upon by the Russian Government as regards the evacuation of the Darwaz district of Bokhara, lately ceded to Afghanistan.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No information of a trustworthy character has been received as to the treatment or disposal of the Kafir prisoners; as regards those who remain in Kafiristan I have received from no reliable source any information contradicting the statement I made on the 20th February.

The conditions connected with the transfer of the Darwaz district of Bokhara are so widely different from those surrounding Kafiristan that I should doubt the expediency of pressing on His Highness the Amír the special arrangements suggested by the hon. member; but any favourable opportunity of exercising beneficial influence on behalf of the Kafirs will be made use of by the Government of India, and I will communicate with the Viceroy as to the possibility of providing for the peaceable settlement in suitable districts of such Kafirs as may have taken refuge in British protectorate.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked whether influence might not be used to prevent the expatriation of these Kafirs altogether?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I cannot go beyond the answer I have given.

March 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Statement of Trade). Copy presented of Statement of the Trade of British India with British Possessions and Foreign Countries for the five years 1890-91 to 1894-5 [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY PENSION.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked the Secretary of State for War whether his attention had been drawn to the case of Patrick Lynch, late of the 108th regiment, who gave eighteen years' service, fifteen of it in India, and was engaged in battle at Bandah and several other engagements, was awarded four good-conduct badges and the Indian medal and clasp, and discharged in 1872 on account of disease, the result of long service in India, on a pension of ninepence per day; whether he was aware that Lynch, being unable to work or support himself on his pension, was obliged to go into the Kilkenny workhouse, where he was at present; and whether, in consideration of his good character and distinguished service, he would increase Lynch's pension to enable him to support himself outside the workhouse?

Mr. J. POWELL-WILLIAMS: This case will be referred for enquiry by the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital.

MADRAS PROPRIETARY VILLAGE SERVICE ACT.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Select Committee of the Madras Legislative Council, in reporting on the Bill, which afterwards became Act II. of 1894 (Madras Proprietary Village Service Act), stated that they had no information regarding the duties of village servants, other than the village accountant; whether the Act had been brought into force, and, if not, would he explain for what reason; and whether, according to Mr. J. D. Rees, Head Assistant Collector at Tinnevelly, and other authorities, interference with the ancient village police system had led to an increase of crime.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Select Committee gave their want of information as a reason for leaving to the Board of Revenue the definition of the duties of the various classes of village officers, instead of attempting to define them in the Act. I am not aware that the Act has been brought into operation. The delay is presumably due to the necessity for thoroughly investigating the conditions of each locality before bringing it under the Act. Under the "ancient village

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

system" in force in the particular locality of which Mr. Rees was writing, the villagers were in the habit of engaging as policemen professional robbers, who divided their remuneration with their caste-fellows. It was probably the suppression of this blackmailing which in Mr. Rees opinion led to an increase of crime in 1878, but a more obvious cause is the famine of the previous year.

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was now able to lay upon the Table any papers or correspondence relating to the disputes between the Government of India and the Máhárája of Jhalawar; whether he was able to state whether the telegram from Calcutta, published in yesterday's *Daily Chronicle*, announcing the deposition of the Prince, was correct; whether, in accordance with the pledge of the Government given on the 25th ultimo, the Máhárája would have every opportunity of submitting his reply to the charges made against him; and whether those charges would be made the subject of a public enquiry, in which the Máhárája would have the advantage of legal advice.

Mr. E. H. PICKERSGILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was true, as reported, that the Máhárája of Jhalawar had been deposed.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I must invite the attention of the hon. member to my reply on the 24th of February. Until I have received by mail the final orders and papers from the Indian Government relating to the case, I cannot say what papers I can produce. I am informed by telegram that the enquiry has resulted in the deposition of the Máhárája Rana, and that this decision has been made known in Jhalawar. The charges brought against His Highness have been fully explained to him, and his written answers received. There has been no restriction upon his seeking advice, and the enquiry has been conducted according to the usual practice, which I am not disposed to modify.

THE MAHARAJA OF PATNA.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State of India if he would instruct the Government of India to order a public inquiry into all the circumstances relating to the suicide of the Máhárája and of the Máhárani of Patna?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The unfortunate circumstance referred to is one of which I possess no further details than are supplied by the Press and the answer given in the Viceroy's Council on the 6th February. Mr. Woodburn then replied that the Government of the Central Provinces had instituted full enquiries, the result of which was to show that the Máhárája shot his wife and himself, being undoubtedly insane at the time. The Government of India did not think any further enquiry necessary, and I have no reason to differ from that view.

Dr. CLARK: Is the right hon. gentleman aware of the fact the Máhárája, before shooting his wife and committing suicide, wrote stating that he was driven to this course in consequence of the persecution of the Foreign Office?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No, Sir; the immediate cause of the suicide was insanity.

THE MOPLAH FANATICS.

Dr. TANNER asked the Secretary of State for India if he would explain the circumstances under which the South Staffordshire regiment attacked and killed 100 Moplahs near Madras; and whether there was any resistance offered by the Moplahs?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have learned by telegram from the Government of Madras that a collision has taken place between the troops and a body of Moplah fanatics, who had committed five murders, and had then taken possession of a Hindu Temple at Manjeri. In the fighting which ensued, 88 of the latter were killed and five wounded, but the Government when they telegraphed were not aware of the immediate cause of the outbreak, nor do they mention the circumstances under which the conflict took place. Further information is expected shortly, and when I receive it I shall be ready to communicate it to the House.

Mr. J. W. LOGAN asked how many of the British troops were killed or wounded in the affray?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The telegram does not state.

THE CANTONMENT OF MHOW.

Mr. J. CALDWELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian Government was aware that the Cantonment of Mhow, with a population of 32,000, had been only using twelve acres of land for the manure yard or pit for the burying of the night soil and refuse since the first establishment of the station, without any seasonal cultivation of crops; how long this state of matters was to be allowed to be continued; what was the amount at the credit of the Cantonment Fund of Mhow at the date of the last return in his possession; how the funds were invested; and whether the Indian Government would take steps for having such balances or part thereof applied to the improvement of the sanitary condition of the bazaars in the Cantonment.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no official information of the circumstances detailed by the hon. member as to the Cantonment of Mhow, but I will call the attention of the Government of India to the subject.

THE PATNA AND JHALAWAR CASES.

On the motion for the adjournment of the House,

Dr. CLARK complained that the Secretary for India had given insufficient information in regard to the deposition by the Indian Government, without due enquiry, of the Máhárája of Jhalawar and the suicide of the Máhárája of Patna, about whom questions had been asked at question time. It was a very serious matter for the people of India if native rulers were to be secretly deposed by a mere Departmental Committee without getting a fair trial, and without any information being given to the House of Commons in the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said it was quite true that the Máhárája of Jhalawar had been deposed, but circumstances warranted that action on the part of the Government of India. The Máhárája was first deposed in 1884 by Lord Ripon, when Viceroy of India, and was subsequently partially reinstated; but circumstances had since arisen which compelled the Government of India, in the interest of the people over whom he ruled, to again depose the Máhárája. When papers containing full particulars of the occurrence arrived from India it would be found that the action of the Indian Government was fully justified. Then, in regard to the suicide of the Máhárája of Patna, the hon. member had said at question time that the Máhárája had been driven to this act by the persecution of the Indian Government. There was no doubt the Máhárája was insane, and he might have got into his head that he had a grievance against the Government of India. He thought the House should not be made a platform on which to discuss matters of this kind. He certainly, as long as he had anything to do with the Government of India, would not interfere. The Government had a duty to perform towards the people of India, and if they found that anyone was abusing his power they could not allow it. He thought that when the papers were laid on the Table the hon. gentleman would see that there was no alternative to the course taken by the Government.

Dr. TANNER: How soon may we expect these papers?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I cannot say.

Dr. TANNER: About what date approximately? (Order, order.)

March 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ROYAL INDIAN MARINE.

Mr. P. M. THORNTON asked the First Lord of the Admiralty whether any officers of the Royal Indian Marines were offered commissions as supernumerary lieutenants in the British Navy, when 100 candidates were recently selected for these posts from the Royal Naval Reserve and other sources.

Mr. G. J. GOSCHEN: One officer of the Royal Indian Marines has been offered a commission on the supplementary list of the Royal Navy, provided that he passes the Board of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Trade examination. I do not know that any other application has been received.

March 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS IN MADRAS.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India if he would issue to members as a Parliamentary Paper the recently published Report regarding the possibility of introducing land and agricultural banks into the Madras Presidency.

Lord George Hamilton: The Report on agricultural banks in India is not complete. Volume I. only has come home, and the Report has not yet been considered by the Government in India or by the Secretary of State in Council:

It would, therefore, be premature to lay a part of the Report on the Table; but a copy of Volume I. has been placed in the library of the House, and ten more copies of that volume could be made available for hon. members interested in the subject.

I shall be happy to supply a copy to the hon. member.

CHOLERA AT LUCKNOW.

Dr. Tanner asked the Under Secretary of State for War, whether any attention had been paid to the report on the outbreak of cholera at Lucknow:

What was the present condition of the filter beds attached to the wells:

Whether it had been substantiated that these wells were contaminated with the cholera microbe:

And, what were the reasons given for the high mortality, 97 in 144.

Lord George Hamilton: The report on the outbreak of cholera at Lucknow in 1894 has no doubt been fully considered by the military authorities in India, but I have not received a copy of the report.

The cantonment is now supplied with pure water by the Lucknow municipality.

The opinion of the committee was that the sand in the filter bed attached to the wells was contaminated with the microbe of cholera.

No special reasons were assigned for the high mortality, which, however, was not higher than the average.

March 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HOSTILITIES NEAR MOMBASA.

Sir Charles Dilke asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what Indian troops had been engaged in military operations in the neighbourhood of Mombasa, under the command of Captain Barratt, 1st Sikhs, and Lieutenant Scott, 3rd Sikhs; who had directed in chief the military operations on the east coast of Africa; whether, in the course of the present year, fighting had been going on in the suburbs of Mombasa itself; and whether the fighting in the immediate neighbourhood of Mombasa and the recent hostility of the Masai tribe had delayed the construction of the Uganda Railway.

Mr. George Curzon: The Indian troops in question are Punjaubi Mussulman or Pathan Volunteers from Indian regiments, 300 in number, who belong to the regular police force of the Protectorate. Major Hatch is the officer in chief command. The missionary station at Frere Town was attacked on January 21st by marauders, who were repulsed by the native guard without loss to the latter. The construction of the railway has not been interfered with.

SUNDAY OPENING OF MUSEUMS.

Sir S. Montagu, in the course of his speech upon Mr. Massey-Mainwaring's motion in favour of the Sunday opening of museums, said: The only difficulty, if any, lay in the employment of extra people in museums and galleries on Sundays. He said extra people, because policemen and other guardians were now very rightly employed on Sundays to protect our art treasures, although the public were excluded on that day. He believed very few extra men would be required in London on Sundays, and they could be chosen from those who had another day of rest. Supporters of the movement cited provincial towns where museums were opened on Sundays, but Government were not directly responsible for that fact; but Her Majesty's Government were directly responsible for what was done in our Indian possessions, and he found that in Calcutta the Great Indian Museum was open free to the public on Sundays. Of course it might be said that those employed there were not Christians. But that course could be adopted in this country if necessary. British subjects, either Muhammadans or Jews, could be had as volunteer guardians on Sundays, or at the cost of a few shillings each.

March 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BEHAR OPIUM AGENCY.

Mr. Arthur Pease asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government had any information as to the progress made by the Government of India in arranging that the Behar Opium Agency should as the Benares Agency already does, deal direct with the cultivators of opium instead of dealing through middlemen.

Lord George Hamilton: The latest report from the Board of Revenue dated February, 1896, shows that the plan of dealing direct with opium rayats is being tried this season, at the time of making payments, in selected subdivisions of the Behar Opium Agency.

As soon as experience has been gained of the new system, both by rayats and opium revenue officials, it can be introduced gradually into the whole agency.

SURGEON-MAJOR SMITH.

Sir Henry Fowler asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the statement in the *Standard* of the 10th March, as to the case of Surgeon Major Clarence Smith:

Whether the allegations contained in that statement with respect to the gravity of the offence charged against Surgeon Major Smith, the action of the Government of Madras and of the late Secretary of State were correct;

And, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Commission appointed by the late Secretary of State to investigate this case.

Lord George Hamilton: The offence for which Surgeon Major Smith was required to retire from the Service was more serious than would be gathered from the article alluded to, and there was on that point no difference of opinion whatever between the right honourable gentleman and myself.

A Commission had been appointed before I took office to enquire into the accuracy of the allegations made and their report was only received a short time back. The delay that thus occurred in settling the case resulted in a postponement of the date of the retirement of the officer in question, which secured him, according to the existing regulations certain advantages in respect of pension.

It would be contrary to the practice both of the War Office and of the India Office to make public any papers affecting the conduct of an officer upon whom the Secretary of State has passed orders, and I am not prepared to depart from that practice in this case.

March 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "CAT" IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Sir Charles Dilke asked the Secretary of State for India whether flogging by the British cat-o'-nine-tails still continued in the native army in India.

Lord George Hamilton: The instances of flogging in the native army are of rare exception, and average about one in 2,000 annually, but I understand the hon. gentleman has correctly described the instrument which is used on those very exceptional occasions.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE.

Sir H. Havelock-Allan, seconding Sir J. Colomb's motion with reference to the Army Estimates, said: Circumstances had again arisen on the south-eastern frontier of India, where the gradual advance of another friendly power had placed our frontiers co-terminous with the frontiers of France, Siam, and China. He said without hesitation that all those circumstances taken together constituted the strongest justification for the motion of his hon. friend, and of the endeavour he had made to see the people of this country taken into the confidence of the authorities on a question which excited little attention, but if it did excite the attention it deserved would place our army on the same footing in popular favour as our navy was at present. If these questions were to assume an acute form, and to resolve themselves into a demonstration on the northern frontier of India, what would our position be? Out of the available force we had in this country there would be required at less than a month's notice a reinforcement of our Indian force of 50,000 men. Lord Roberts and others were of opinion that the available force in India for operations on the north-west frontier would not exceed 60,000 men in two army corps at Peshawar and Quetta. If, therefore, any demonstration should be made against our Indian frontier, we should be obliged immediately to send at least 50,000 men to reinforce our garrisons in India. As to the south-eastern frontier—Burma, Siam, and the provinces of the Chinese Empire—it might happen that it would be necessary to reinforce our armies in Burma, the Straits Settlements, and China by at least 10,000 men. We might also hear of certain contingencies calling for the reinforcemeut of our forces in Egypt to the extent of 10,000 men. Out of the disposable force we might at any time be called upon at a month's notice to send 50,000 to India, 10,000 to Egypt, 10,000 to coaling stations, and communications in the Straits of Malacca and the Eastern Seas. What, then, became of the one army corps which they were told successive Secretaries for War had carefully prepared and elaborated. That army corps would be absorbed three times over. Those who had closely examined the military aspect of our needs said, that in order to put this country in a position to support its military interests abroad, three army corps, or 90,000 men, ought to be available for foreign service contingencies. Two of the army corps should be complete, and the third should be available for completion, say in two months. What they asked for, therefore, was not an increase of expenditure, but a better adaptation of means to an end through better organisation.

March 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

Mr. Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India whether Sir J. Westland, the Finance Minister of India, had accepted as correct the estimate of the Bombay Millowners' Association that the recent modification of the Cotton Duties involved an increase of the excise levied in India from seven to eighteen lakhs of rupees.

Lord George Hamilton: Sir James Westland is reported to have said, in the debate of the 3rd of February, that he accepted these figures for present purposes, but that they in no way affected the principle of the Bill under discussion, viz., that of absolute equality of treatment. The report of this debate, together with other papers on the same subject, will shortly be ready for distribution.

THE HEMP DRUG COMMISSION.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a Bill to amend the Excise Act, 1881, which had been introduced into the Legislative Council of India by Sir James Westland, purporting to give legislative effect to the recommendations of the Indian Hemp Drug Commission, appointed in consequence of a motion of this House:

Whether he was aware that this Bill proposed to grant the power to license hemp drugs in Burma, where it had hitherto been prohibited; that Sir James Westland, in his speech introducing the Bill, stated that the Government did not propose, even if these powers were enacted, to make any alteration in the system of administration of hemp drugs in that province; that the Commissioners unanimously reported that there ought to be a five tola maximum limit of possession of the drug all over India; and that this provision was not included in the Bill:

And whether he would examine this Bill in connexion with the Report and recommendations of the Commission.

Lord George Hamilton: The amending Bill to which the hon. member refers was introduced to give effect to the restrictive suggestions of the Hemp Drugs Commission, and that object will be kept in view.

As regards Burma, the existing law gives powers as to granting licences for the growth, preparation, and possession of ganja, which are not now exercised. The amending Bill introduces no change in this respect, and it is not proposed to make any use at present of these powers.

As regards the rest of India, I am advised that this Bill does not alter the existing law, under which five tolas is fixed as the limit for the retail sale of ganja; and it renews the provision that no unlicensed person may have in his possession more than that quantity of the drug.

ARMY PENSIONS.

Mr. D. Macaleese asked the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he had received an application from Patrick Bryan, of Smithborough, county Monaghan, for a small increase of pension; and, considering that Bryan served in the 46th Regiment in the Crimea and gained a medal and clasp, and also served in India during the Mutiny, altogether for eighteen years on foreign service, and that he was now over sixty years of age, and unable, owing to a recent serious accident, to perform any labour to assist him in supporting himself and his wife, whether the War Office authorities could see their way to accede to his request for an increase of pension.

Mr. Powell-Williams: Patrick Bryan was awarded the pension authorised by the regulation for his service at the time of his discharge from the army, and there is no regulation which enables pensions to be revised on grounds unconnected with military service.

SUPPLY.—ARMY ESTIMATES.

Sir C. Dilke, in the course of his speech upon the vote for army pay and allowances, said: When the present Government came into office there was a wide and searching discussion of the whole principles of army administration, and two large questions were raised to which the Government turned their immediate attention—namely, War Office administration and Cabinet responsibility in connexion with national defence. From the statement of the Under Secretary for War it appeared that War Office administration had been developed on the lines of the scheme laid before the House last August. But he himself was far from satisfied with it in the form it had assumed, and they did not see in the Army or Navy Estimates any evidence that up to the present time the matter had been thoroughly considered. It was true that we had a new Commander-in-Chief, that the Government had not been in office long, and that the Cabinet Committee on Defence had not long been constituted, and that it would be a mistake to change too suddenly the principles on which the defence of the country had been conducted in the past. But next year they would expect to see in the Army and Navy Estimates more evidence that the matter had been thoroughly considered. The expenditure of the country on land forces, taking England and India into account—for the problems of the British army could not be effectively considered unless the Indian army was taken into account—had been £36,250,000, and the Under Secretary said this was larger than the expenditure of any other power. But for the £36,250,000—and the sum would be larger next year—we did not attain such results as, in the absence of conscription, we should look for here and in India. Here we seemed to fall between two stools. We had confessedly no army in this country at present that could hope successfully to resist invasion by armies organised on a Continental scale. We spent a good deal of money on our land forces without obtaining for the money we spent an army which would enable us to resist invasion supposing our fleet failed. We failed not in the numbers of men but in the organisation of those men. We failed in tactics, in artillery, and the practice of our generals in command. . . . . Last year he said that what had been done in Belgium might be an example to us. In Belgium there were eight cavalry regiments in eight stations, chiefly manufacturing towns, and the regiments had been concentrated

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

in two stations at two towns. He earnestly hoped that the Government might be working in this direction, and that the small detachments in manufacturing towns might be grouped together in places where they could get real cavalry training, as they did in India.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that in making a comparison between this country and Germany, the right hon. gentleman, the member for the Forest of Dean did not keep in view two important facts—one, that in Germany conscription took men away from the ordinary work of the country at the very best time of their life and when they were most useful to society. (Hear, hear.) If he were to assess that consideration in money it would be difficult to say what the effect would be in comparison as to cost. The other fact was that the same principle which applied to conscription, placed the whole civil community in Germany practically at the disposal of the army. In Germany the country was adapted to the needs of the army, whereas in England, the army was adapted to the needs of the country. (Hear, hear.) The same consideration should be taken into account in regard to the manœuvres on a large scale. In this country we had to pass a Bill and set up a Committee to assess damages and consider rights and prejudices of the general community, whereas in Germany, the troops could march straight across country without any obstacle or difficulty. If they took into consideration the additional cost imposed on this country for its defence, and the fact that we had to garrison India and the colonies, that also made a material difference compared with Germany, which was exempt from such demands. All those facts showed that it was impossible to have an accurate comparison; but, as he had frequently said, our estimates had, at any rate, this advantage—that they brought under the notice of the House and the country, almost the whole of the cost of our military system, and he was not aware that any foreign estimates even professed to do anything of the sort.

Mr. H. O. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that he had asked a question with reference to the howitzers manufactured for the Indian and Home Governments. He had pointed out that we are making a 5·4 inch howitzer for India at Bombay, and a 5 inch howitzer at Woolwich for the use of the Home and Colonial army, but the answer he had received did not seem to him to be a very serious one. It was said that the howitzer in India was intended to break down walls, while the howitzer in Europe was intended for a different purpose. It was pointed out that they would be harnessed with bullocks in India and with horses in Europe. That was hardly an answer to the question. The fact was that the howitzer had not been really designed as part of a plan, but had been produced as the result of a pure blunder. Sixteen guns had been made for India, and no more would be made. Those guns would be dragged by horses in India, but as the howitzers were in India and as ammunition would have to follow them everywhere confusion would result until the guns were withdrawn. Taken with other facts this was very important. We had got into such a wilderness with regard to the types of guns that he did not know how we should be able to extricate ourselves from the difficulty. . . . . The Ordnance Committee had misled them over and over again. It misled them absolutely with regard to the navy, and they saw now the confusion it had left them in in regard to their land guns. Here was the last instance, and he would respectfully suggest to the Under Secretary that he might possibly recommend that this error might be cancelled, and that instead of sending these four batteries of 5·4 inch howitzers cruising about in India—there was not another gun in the whole of the British empire, on sea or on land, which would take that projectile—he might regard it as a bad debt, stop the making of the pattern at Woolwich, and take the first step in the direction of uniformity of ammunition and type of gun.

March 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Kammalahs of Southern India.—Petition from Madras, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

DELAY OF PENSIONS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the great delay which repeatedly occurred in the admission of officers in the Indian Civil Service, formerly classed as uncovenanted, to their pensions at the end of their leave at home, and the consequent hardship on men who had retired, owing to the inability of the India Office to pay them their pensions until notified of the amount from India:

And whether, if the Indian Government could not be induced to adopt measures to fix and report the amount of pension previously to notified retirements, or coincidently with retirement, it could be arranged that such retired officers who had arrived in this country might draw a certain proportion of their pensions based on the record of the length and character of their services, or whether he would consider what steps could be taken to remedy the inconvenience.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I am sorry to say that delay does occasionally occur, but in most cases it is owing to the fact that the officer in question has applied for a special pension, which it is not in the power of the audit officers to pass without special authority.

Rules have been laid down in India for the express purpose of accelerating, as far as possible, the payment of pensions, especially in cases where there is some doubt as to the proper amount of the pension; and the India Office, in such cases, pays promptly a provisional sum, subject to adjustment afterwards.

OFFICERS ON THE GENERAL LIST.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could state how many men of the surviving officers of the general list, Indian army, signed the declaration that their appointments were to be "subject to any alterations that might be subsequently ordered in the conditions of service:"

And, whether he would state the precise date on which the declaration was first actually signed by a cadet on appointment.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Of the officers now on the general list, eleven filled up the old form of nomination which did not contain the question referred to by my honourable friend; there were in India at the time of their appointment, and it is not known what form they signed; the remaining fifty-five signed the new form.

The 17th December, 1858, is the date on which the new form was first signed by a cadet.

INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was pledged to give the concession for the Grand Chord Line, viz., from Mogulserai to Barakar, to the East India Railway Company:

Whether he had granted to the East India Railway Company a concession to build from Mogulserai to Chergotty:

Whether he was aware of the strong feeling, repeatedly expressed through the Chamber of Commerce and otherwise, entertained by the mercantile community of Calcutta against granting the East India Railway Company a perpetual monopoly of the traffic between that port and Oudh, the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab:

And, whether he would, in deference to that feeling, arrange with the Bengal and Nagpur Railway Company, or some other line, to give an alternative route from Mogulserai into Calcutta.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It has been determined that the Chord Line between Mogulserai and Barakar shall, when constructed, be part of the East India Railway system, and the construction of a line from Mogulserai by Chergotty to Gya, forming the first instalment of the Chord Line, has accordingly been entrusted to the East India Railway Company. The opinions of the mercantile communities in India have been communicated from time to time to the Government of India, and to the Secretary of State, and have been duly considered, together with the other circumstances of the case; but there is no present intention of constructing any line between Mogulserai and Calcutta other than that which I have mentioned.

BIMETALLISM.

Reference was made to India by various speakers in the debate on Mr. H. H. Whiteley's motion as follows: "That this House is of opinion that the instability of the relative value of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

gold and silver since the action of the Latin Union in 1873 has proved injurious to the best interests of this country, and urges upon the Government the advisability of doing all in their power to secure by international agreement a stable monetary par of exchange between gold and silver."

Sir W. H. Houldsworth, in the course of his speech, said: The other great danger—and he believed it to be the greater of the two—was the competition of silver using countries with gold using countries. The yellow man with the white money was against the white man with the yellow money. The East—Japan especially, and China to some extent—were advancing by leaps and bounds, under the artificial stimulus of depreciated silver, in the making of all kinds of articles, and thus coming into competition with us in neutral markets, certainly in silver-using lands, and even in our own country. That was the great danger we would have to face if there was not established a stable monetary par of exchange between gold and silver, the competition of silver-using countries which would force our industries into a state of depression from which it would be very difficult to raise them. He would venture to give the House one concrete case of this severe competition. This was an extract from a report by a gentleman who had had great experience in the East: "I have here before me, for instance, a Japan-made shirt. It is of good quality, hand-made. That shirt cost two dollars. In the days of the four-shilling dollar, therefore, to go no farther back, it would have cost eight shillings, could not have competed with an English-made one, and would have no existence. It still costs two dollars; but the fall of the dollar to two shillings reduces its equivalent cost in English money to four shillings, and it cannot be made in England at that price." The *Times*, which was not very favourable to bimetallism, which was rather disposed to think that bimetallists were complaining very much of a condition of things that was not justified by facts, published on October 28th, 1895, a special article on "Indian Affairs," which said: "As European statesmen are now compelled to recognise in Japan a predominant factor in Eastern politics, so British capitalists and Indian millowners are being forced to acknowledge her successes in the great commercial struggle of the nations. . . . . India enters on the struggle with her mints closed and with the mints of Japan open. The avowed object of the closing of the Indian mints is to create an artificial scarcity of coin in India and to give to the rupee an artificial value. We have from the first pointed out the economic dangers incident to experiment. In proportion as the artificial appreciation the rupee affords permanent relief to Indian official finance regard to gold obligations, it lays a permanent burden upon Indian production in the competition with silver-using countries." The writer went on to say: "One does not require to believe in bimetallism in order to recognise the enormous advantages which the manufacturers in a silver country enjoy in competing with gold countries." That was the great danger that lay before us if a monetary par of exchange between gold and silver was not established.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, in the course of his speech said: May not there be a reason for this fall in prices which has absolutely nothing whatever to do with any question of the appreciation of gold? Surely the fall has been, as Mr. William Henry Smith said in this House nine years ago, in the articles in which the production is practically unlimited, and not in the articles of which the production is practically limited. The fact is this—that the fall in these articles is due to foreign competition—(cheers)—and foreign competition is due, first, to peace, which has enabled greater industry to be used in their production; secondly, to the more efficient use of capital; thirdly, perhaps to the use of the telegraph; fourthly, to the vast extension of railways in new countries—in America, in the Argentine Republic, in Russia, and in India—which has brought the produce of these countries to the sea; lastly, and perhaps most of all, to the wonderful improvements in our mercantile marine, in the size of ships, in the cheapness of the working of marine engines, so that, in fact, the harvests of the world can now be brought from the places where they are produced to the very door of any country that may require them almost as cheaply as if they were produced in that country itself. . . . . I turn to what may be due to the fall in the price of silver. It has often been argued that the fall in the price of silver has brought Indian wheat into very serious competition with wheat grown in this country. That may be true to some extent, but this is a fact, the true import of which agricultural products from silver using countries are now only 2 per cent. of the total amount of agricultural produce imported into this country, which competes with agricultural produce grown at home, and the Indian harvests cannot be—both from the varying amount of their exportation, and from the total amount that could be exported—anything like as potent a factor in determining the price of wheat in the world as the harvests, for instance, of Russia or of the Argentine Republic. I find that in the year 1894 only half the amount of wheat was exported from British India that was exported in the previous year; and I find that the amount exported in 1894 was very little higher than the amount exported in 1877, when silver was nearly double the price at which it stood in 1894. (Cheers.) My hon. friend, who seconded this motion said a good deal about the effect of the low price of silver in silver-using countries in the East upon the competition of these countries with Lancashire. I think he referred mainly, if not entirely, to the cotton industry of Lancashire. I very much question whether other trades have complained of this competition, and if they have not I should very much like to know why. Why is it that the cotton industry of Lancashire is the particular trade that complains of this competition, because if there is this great importance attached to the bounty that may be due to the fall in the value of silver, surely it would apply to other trades besides the cotton industry? But this, at any rate, I believe to be the fact, that the cotton industry of Lancashire is not quite expiring. I am informed that the number of spindles and looms is increasing in Lancashire.

Mr. George Whiteley: It is very much less.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach: That is the information that has reached me. I am also informed that the wages of the operatives employed in the cotton industry are better than they were.

Mr. G. Whiteley: They are 10 per cent. below the standard list.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach: I believe the fact is that more of the profits of the industry go into the pockets of the operatives than before, and less into the pockets of the masters. That might be a fact to be regretted if it led masters to abandon the cotton industry. But why should they abandon the cotton industry? Is the trade with silver countries in the Lancashire cotton trade a losing one? If it is, I am curious to know why our exports of cotton goods to these silver-using countries is increasing by a percentage three times as large as the percentage of increase in the trade between Lancashire and other countries that are not silver-using. (Hear, hear.) I do not wish at all to underrate the importance, whatever it may be, of the fall in silver in the competition between Lancashire and the East in this matter, but I believe the danger of the competition—and I believe it to be a very real danger—is more due to other causes. I believe it is due, in the first place, to the fact that the cotton is nearer at hand there: in the second place, the fact that the market is on the spot; in the third place—and by far the greatest of all—to the extreme cheapness of the labour. That labour is probably made more cheap by the effect of the bounty on the fall in silver, and, therefore, the competition becomes harder. I admit to that extent that the fall in silver has been an evil. The fluctuations in the value between silver and gold have also been an evil owing to the difficulties which they have caused in the rate of exchange between gold-using and silver-using countries. We may wish, all of us, that there will be only one standard in the whole civilised world; but I am afraid that is a dream that is not likely to be realised. But even the influence, injurious though it may be, on commerce, of the fluctuations of the rate of exchange has certainly been minimised by the operations of the exchange banks. What, after all, is the great difficulty in this question as it affects ourselves, is the influence of the fall in silver upon the fortunes of our great dependency of India. I think it has always been admitted by all parties in this House, that the great fall of silver has been a serious evil and difficulty to the Government of India. A few years ago the Government of India took the step of closing the mints against the free coinage of silver. Since that time they have, to a great extent, achieved what I imagine was their object, in preventing the fall of the rupee. But there was this remarkable result—the price of silver has very largely fallen, and every year there is an increasing divergence between the market value of the coined rupee and the real value of the silver which is in that rupee. In fact,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India now has an inconvertible, appreciated currency. (Hear, hear.) That is not a position—however much relief it may have given for a time to the Government of India—which, I think, can be held to be a satisfactory or final solution of this great question. (Cheers.) I therefore do believe that, in the matters which I have alluded to, there are, as this motion states, evils affecting this country and our Indian empire in the present low value of silver, and we are perfectly ready, as we have always been to join with foreign countries in a conference as to the best way in which those evils may be alleviated. But I would wish to say that there was a part of the empire which is not included in the United Kingdom, and which is not included in India, which has great interests in this matter besides ourselves. I refer to our Colonial empire. (Hear, hear.) We have in the United Kingdom a population of 38,000,000. Our colonies have a population of 20,500,000. Of these no less than 15,500,000 are on the basis of a gold standard, with imports and exports, in 1893, of £227,500,000 —four-fifths of the total colonial foreign trade. That includes all the great self-governing colonies, and the bulk of the Crown colonies. On the other hand, there are silver currency colonies, containing a population of 1,500,000 and with a trade of £48,000,000; and there are colonies with the peculiar rupee currency of India, containing a population of 3,500,000, and with a trade of £12,000,000. It is obvious that in dealing with this question, the interests of our gold-standard colonies cannot and ought not to be neglected. (Cheers.) And let the House remember that each and everyone of these colonies, whether it be a self-governing colony or a Crown colony, is, and I think always has been perfectly free to choose its own currency for itself. Therefore, vast as the population of India is, great as are the interests of our Indian empire, you have, I will venture to contend, even apart from the United Kingdom, enormous interests on the other side. (Hear, hear.) What is the policy which, as a Government, we intend to pursue? As I have said, we are willing, we are anxious, seeing that there are evils in the present low value of silver, and in the fluctuations in the value of the two metals, to enter into a conference, or into negotiations, which certainly I believe at the present stage would be much better than a conference, with other countries upon this subject, but we are not prepared to abandon the gold standard in the United Kingdom. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. J. M. MACLEAN, in the course of his speech, said: The Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to indicate that poor India was to be stretched out on the rack again and vivisected for the benefit of the rest of mankind. He said that everybody agreed that the depreciation of silver had been a very great misfortune for India. They all agreed that it had been a great inconvenience to the Indian Government, but he demurred entirely to the proposition that it had been a calamity for the people of India or for the trade of that country generally. He regretted very much the experiment of closing the mints, for that was really giving encouragement to speculation in silver, and he feared that if another change was now introduced it would only lead to more gambling of the same kind. India had fully recovered from the effects of the closing of her mints. There had been a very remarkable expansion in the circulation of currency notes, which had taken, to a great degree, the place of rupees, and there had also been a large number of rupees brought into circulation from the hoards accumulated in India through many centuries. In that way the need of the country for a large currency had been supplied, and he did not think India was likely to be the gainer by any bargain that might be made for the opening of the Indian mints on condition that the Latin Union re-opened their mints. The hon. baronet the member for Manchester, being apparently gravelled for lack of matter, was kind enough to make a personal attack on him (Mr. Maclean), referring to a paper which he read fifteen years ago at the Society of Arts, in which he believed he stated, for the first time in England, it was a great mistake to suppose that, although the Government of India lost money on remittances to this country, that India, as a country, was adversely affected by bimetallism. He had studied this question in India for some years, where it was a popular subject for discussion long before it was adopted in this country. Speaking generally, he should say the study of bimetallism was a fascinating intellectual exercise for people of subtle minds with a strong taste for paradox. He was not of a metaphysical turn of mind himself, but he confessed the subject had great attractions for him, and coming fresh from India, where his business experience had been acquired, he devoted his paper mainly to the Indian aspect of the case, indicating his belief, towards the end, that what India gained had perhaps been lost by England. There were probably very few hon. members who could say that all the opinions of fifteen years ago were those which were held by them at the present moment, and he thought it some advantage to a man to have been able to survey the subject from different points of view. As he gained greater experience and knowledge of the course of trade of this country he certainly changed his opinion on this point, and he guarded himself to the extent that he said bimetallism was possible if they had a stable ratio agreed to by all countries and if the Government took under their own control the production of the silver in the mines, thereby making a Government monopoly of it. Those two conditions were impracticable and could not be carried out.

Mr. S. SMITH, in the course of his speech, said: He quite admitted that the present price of silver was not a proper price, and that it would never have fallen to 30d. but for the demonetisation and the closing of the mints. But still it was there, and the trade of the world had adjusted itself to its present position, and he did think that the nations that really desired to re-establish silver must do it at some different ratio. If asked his opinion as to the proper ratio, he should like to see it at a parity with 1s. 4d. for the rupee, which was the arrangement made when the mints were closed in India. Everyone knew that for twenty years the Indian Government had been struggling with financial difficulties, owing to the fluctuations in exchange and the immense fall in the value of the rupee. But he wanted to call attention to one great evil which had resulted from this state of things—that was the closing of the mints, which he believed was inevitable under the circumstances. He wished to point out that it was a very unfortunate thing that we required in India an artificial currency in place of an automatic currency; in other words, the value of the rupee in India was the metal of the coin, just as the value of the sovereign was the metal which represented it. We had been obliged to go in for an artificial currency, and now the rupee had increased in value to 20 per cent. more than the silver which composed it. There was a great danger of illicit coining. Indeed, he thought it was impossible to prevent rupees being smuggled into a country of so vast an extent as India, with many native States and so extended a seaboard, so long as an artificial value attached to the coins. The hon. member for Cardiff made a great deal of the activity of machine-makers in Oldham and Lancashire as a proof that the cotton industry was increasing. It was perfectly true that nearly all the machinery made in Lancashire went to foreign countries. There had been an immense demand for machinery for India, China, and Japan, and from all he could learn our great competitor in the future would be Japan. Undoubtedly one of the reasons which gave Japan a great advantage was that she was a silver country, and that the cost of production was much less than in Lancashire, which worked on the gold currency. That was the point to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed his very able speech. It had been plain to him for many years that this country could not change its gold standard. He must admit that the difficulties were insuperable. Long habit, long tradition, the violent prejudices of the moneyed classes, and many other reasons, made it impossible that this country could give up its gold standard. That was no reason, however, why we should not give any help we could to other countries which had not anything like the reasons we had against setting up a bimetallic system. He believed in Germany a very little amount of encouragement would have a good effect, while in America the two sides were almost balanced, and a very little aid from this country might create a movement in favour of the bimetallic system. The great aid we could give was undoubtedly the reopening of the Indian mints, which was a very large undertaking, seeing that they would probably take about one-fourth or one-third of the entire silver production. He thought it was coming to be understood by the Powers of Europe that this was about as much as they could expect the British Empire to do.

Mr. G. WHITELEY, in the course of his speech said:—The Chancellor of the Exchequer asked how it was that the Lancashire cotton trade, of all trades in the United Kingdom, suffered so much from the appreciation of gold. It was because the export of cotton goods from Lancashire to India (10) per cent. of the total export of goods from this country. In the face of the serious competition in India

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

it was no wonder that Lancashire was the first to cry out. . . . It was urged against bimetallists that they were playing the game of silver-producing nations of the world, and of those countries which had large stocks of silver, and the question was asked whether we were going to constitute England the dumping ground for those nations. The United States possessed in sterling value 131 millions of silver as against 130 millions of gold. What advantage would the United States derive from bimetallism over the general average of mankind? In India there were 590 millions worth of silver, or more than one-sixth of the total production of the world during the last 400 years. When hon. members spoke of the possibility of our markets being flooded with silver they overlooked the fact that we were the holders of one-third of the silver of the world, so that we could shoot it into other countries as much as they could shoot it into this.

Mr. J. Kenyon, in the course of his speech, said:—The hon. member for Stockport had argued that large quantities of silver would be sent to this country from the United States and that we should receive a benefit by sending over merchandise in exchange. Our experience of the United States would not support the conclusions of the hon. member; the people of the United States were quite ready to get as much as they could for their silver or raw material without considering the people to whom they sent either. Those who had not looked into the facts would be surprised to hear that out of the £150,000,000 only £3,100,000 came from silver-using countries while £147,000,000 came from those using either gold or inconvertible paper. It was not the fall in silver, but the fall in freights and the enormous development of railways that brought this increase of competition. The countries which sent us such great supplies of wheat were the United States, Southern Russia, Argentina, and India. In 1870 India had 5,000 miles of railways, she had now over 20,000; Southern Russia had 7,000, she had now 19,000; Argentina had 700, she had now 8,000; the United States had 53,000, they had now 176,000. Taken together, these four countries had in 1870, 66,000 miles; they had now 223,000, an increase of 157,000, which of course had opened up an immense territory. This was the true explanation, and the fall in silver had really nothing, or hardly anything to do with it. . . . . He saw no reason whatever for changing our currency, and overwhelming reasons against it. Was the country as a whole suffering? Were our trades and manufactures falling off? Certainly not. As regarded India the exports and imports, excluding Government stores and treasure amounted in 1873 (in tens of rupees) to £57,000,000, and in 1893-94 to £110,000,000. And how did we stand at home? As regarded the working classes, in 1873 there were 38 paupers in every 1,000, now there were only 23; the average rate of wages had risen from £43 8s. in 1873 to £53 16s. in 1891.

Mr. George Wyndham, in the course of his speech, said that, turning to the East, where silver and note paper was the currency, it would be found that, whereas the Argentine premium on gold was 250 per cent., it was 100 per cent. at Bombay. What was true in India was true all over the East. In that part of the world the prices of labour had not increased, and therefore, they could give their gold customers a reduction of 50 per cent. It was absurd to think that Lancashire by its pluck and industry could go on competing against places where labour was cheap and which obtained the advantage of 50 per cent. profit when they sold us their goods. . . . . He did not believe that the right hon. gentleman, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would maintain for a moment that the more our exports fell off, the happier we should be. In order to show the results of the existing system upon other industries he would take the case of tin. At the Straits Settlements tin could now be sold for £65 instead of £130, and it was stated that if silver continued to fall, those Settlements would be able to shut up every tin mine in Europe. Then again, with regard to coal, the cost of putting a ton of Japanese steam coal on board which used to be 10s. was now only 8s.; with regard to boots, Northampton had now lost the contract for supplying half the Indian army, in consequence of the fall in the price of silver.

Sir W. Harcourt, in the course of his speech, said: It is said that India and the silver-using countries have such an advantage in dealing with other silver-using countries, but it is a very remarkable thing that the exports of India are very much larger to gold-using countries than they are to silver-using countries. It is also a remarkable fact, and this is contrary to the whole bimetallic theory, that the proportionate increase in our trade was much larger to the silver-using countries than it has been to the gold-using countries. (Hear, hear.) I find from the *Economist* of August 31st, 1895, that 14 per cent. of the increase of the exports of the whole trade was to silver-using countries in 1873, and in 1895 it was 22 per cent. This I will say about India, and I think it is a warning which the House ought to take. It is a very solemn warning which is given in the Report of the Royal Commission upon this subject. You affirm that the present system of currency is favourable to the industry of India. There is no doubt that is so. It may be unfavourable to the Indian Government in the exchange upon the home payments here, as we know it is. But your case is that it is a stimulant to industries in India; that it enables them to carry on trade which they did not carry on before. What is going to be the effect on India if this House is going to legislate deliberately with reference to the currency for the purpose of restraining and putting down those industries in India? The language held upon this subject in the Report of the Royal Commission is very well worthy of the attention of the House. They say that the effect on the Indian mind of leading them to believe that one of the objects of the change in the currency is to attack an industry which you regard as a rival to your own is one which will naturally produce immense discontent there. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. J. Balfour, in the course of his speech said:—The right hon. gentleman (Sir W. Harcourt) told us that, holding as we do that the present condition of exchange between England and India afforded an artificial stimulus—a stimulus, he did not say artificial, though I think it is—to Indian manufactures, we should ask what would be thought of our policy by the Indian population if we deliberately adopted a new system under which that stimulus to Indian manufactures would be put an end to. That might be a good argument from some points of view, but it is not from that of the right hon. gentleman, for he was a member of the Government which forced upon India an artificial currency, which tampered with Indian currency, which tampered with the currency of 200 millions of Her Majesty's subjects for the deliberate, avowed, and openly expressed purpose of raising the value of the rupee above the market price, with the inevitable result, in so far as it was raised thus artificially, that the stimulus to Indian exports would be diminished. I think I am absolved from dealing with that argument when it proceeded from a gentleman who has done more than anyone to prove its futility. . . . . The Chancellor of the Exchequer recalled to the memory of the House the ludicrous fact that, at the present moment, within the limits of this one Empire, men's debts are measured by three different standards. They suffer from alteration by three different sets of causes, and they are subject to variations from influences arising from three different quarters. You have a gold standard in this country, and a silver standard in the Straits Settlements, and in those two countries the demand for gold and the demand for silver respectively depends on how the debt which is to be liquidated was contracted. And in India there is a third standard. It is not a demand for gold or a demand for silver, but a demand for that anomalous article invented by the right hon. gentleman opposite, imposed by him on the 200,000,000 of our fellow-subjects in India, and differing from both the gold and the silver standards. (Cheers.) Nothing shall persuade me that it is in conformity with civilisation and common sense that the commercial world should long tolerate so inconvenient, cruel, and absurd a system. (Cheers.)

The resolution was ultimately agreed to without a division.

March 19th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CABUL TREATY.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, when presenting to the House a copy of the Cabul Treaty, he would also include copies of the communications relating to it from the time when the agreement was drafted up to the time when the treaty was ratified and the arrangements completed.

Lord George Hamilton: The arrangements for delimitation arising out of the Cabul Agreement are not yet all com-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

plete or ratified, but when these several agreements have been executed, I shall be glad to place copies of them on the Table.

THE PATNA AND JHALAWAR CASES.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was now in a position to place upon the Table papers relating to the suicide of the late Máhárája of Patna, and the deposition of the Máhárája of Jhalawar.

Lord George Hamilton: I have already informed the hon. member that I do not think it necessary to make any further enquiry as to the death of the late Máhárája of Patna, nor do I propose to lay on the Table papers relating to this subject. As regards the Máhárája of Jhalawar, the report of the Government of India has not yet been received. When it arrives, I will consider what papers can be laid on the Table of the House.

HOSPITALS AT ADEN.

Mr. Moon asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that there was no trained nursing staff in any of the hospitals at Aden, so that the garrison there was at a disadvantage compared with other garrisons under the Government of India; and that one of such hospitals was a general European hospital, in charge of a civil surgeon, to which patients were brought from ships of all nations:

Whether he would communicate with the Resident at Aden and request suggestions for remedying the above deficiency:

And whether he would ascertain the amount of support given to the general hospital by mercantile shipping companies.

Lord George Hamilton: I am aware of the facts stated by the hon. member, but I may observe that there are several garrisons in India to which no trained European nursing staff is attached. I will communicate with the Government of India as to the suggestions made by the hon. member.

LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENT IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the fact, as stated in the Madras Land Revenue Reports, that in the Madras Presidency, during the 12 years 1879-80 to 1890-1, 850,528 tenants of the State had, for the collection of the land revenue, their lands sold by auction to the extent of 1,984,985 acres, and that of this area 1,183,851 acres were bought in by the Government for want of bidders at the auctions:

Whether, in the years 1890-91, 1891-2, 1892-3, and 1893-4, the number of State tenants thus sold up was 10,115, 11,118, 12,400, and 14,198 respectively;

Whether, in the year 1893-4, property, personal and real, of defaulting tenants, of the estimated value of 795,922 rupees, was put up to sale, and under forced sales realised only 209,638 rupees; and whether out of this amount property valued at 25,592 rupees was bought in by the Government for 2,300 rupees:

Whether, with reference to the evictions noticed in Sir Richard Temple's speech on the Indian Budget in 1892, the Secretary of State in 1893 called upon the Madras Government for a report, and whether that report had yet been received:

Whether nearly 3½ million acres of assessed culturable land were now lying waste in the Madras Presidency:

Whether, in the year 1893-4, 5,374,303 notices of demand for land revenue were issued, and 209,517 notices for sale of property, and whether fees upon these notices were levied from defaulters:

And, whether, looking to the above facts, he would cause special enquiry to be made with a view to an improved system of land revenue assessment and collection in the Madras Presidency.

Lord George Hamilton: I cannot trace any reference to Madras evictions in the speech of my right hon. friend, Sir Richard Temple, on the Indian Budget in 1892, but it is the case that my predecessor invited the Government of Madras to report whether some improvement could not be introduced in the method of dealing with land revenue defaulters. I learn from Madras that the Government are considering the matter and hope to report shortly. When the report is received the matter will receive the careful attention of the Secretary of State in Council.

I do not propose to trouble the House with remarks on all the figures cited in the question; some of those figures I have been able to identify in the reports of the Madras Revenue Board, while others appear to be incorrect. But I may add that the subject has been receiving much attention in Madras for some years past; and the "number of revenue defaulters in Madras whose property, real and personal, was sold for arrears" had been reduced from 130,714 in 1883 to 10,115 in 1890.

March 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.)

On the motion of Sir Henry Fowler an Address was granted for a Return of the net income and expenditure of British India, under certain specified heads, for the eleven years from 1884 to 1894-5.

March 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

AMMUNITION IN INDIA.

Colonel Lockwood asked the Secretary of State for India if the reserve of ammunition in India was mainly composed of black powder:

And what per cent. of cartridges were there of black powder over cordite.

Lord G. Hamilton: As cordite has not been issued to the Native army, the reserve of ammunition in India is mainly composed of black powder.

I am afraid I cannot say what is the percentage of such cartridges over those made of cordite.

KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. Arthur Pease asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government had information as to recent military operations by the Afghans in Kafiristan:

And whether they would make representations to the Government of the Amír with regard to the slaughter and enslavement of the Kafirs.

Lord G. Hamilton: I received intelligence early this month that the Sipah Salar had again left Asmar for the Wai Valley with a force, and that the Ramgul Valley in the west of Kafiristan had been occupied after severe fighting by troops sent from Kabul. I have no later information which I can regard as trustworthy.

In accordance with the undertaking which I gave on the 3rd March, a communication was made to the Viceroy, who will use any favourable opportunity of exercising his good offices on behalf of the Amír's Kafir subjects; but I am afraid that under the circumstances I cannot promise more than this.

March 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Mr. Henniker Heaton asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that considerable dissatisfaction still existed among officers of the Indian Staff Corps in consequence of their supersession by the line:

Whether he was aware that the concession of temporary rank to commandants and seconds in command of native regiments did not appreciably prevent their supersession by the line (seeing that officers having permanent rank took precedence of all those serving with them having temporary rank of the same grade), while it created wholesale supersession among staff corps officers themselves:

And, whether he would ask the War Office to reconsider the decision arrived at last year, so as to meet the views expressed by Lord Lansdowne, on behalf of the Government of India, as shown in the Return presented to this House last Session, entitled East India (Staff Corps Officers).

Lord G. Hamilton: No further representation from the Government of India has been received on the subject to which my hon. friend refers, and in the absence of any such representation I do not propose to reopen the question.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 3. MAY, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from March 23rd to April 23rd.

Imperial Parliament.

March 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH SOLDIERS IN INDIA.

Colonel LOCKWOOD asked the Secretary of State for War whether he was in possession of facts confirming a statement from the Calcutta correspondent, which appeared in the *Times* of 18th March, that more than 3,000 British soldiers were constantly in hospital from venereal disease; that the rate of admission to hospital from that cause had risen in 1895 to 511 per 1,000; and that out of a force of 70,000 men only 26,000 had not suffered from it; and whether the Commander-in-Chief in India had made any representation on the subject.

Mr. BRODRICK: The figures quoted in the question are substantially accurate. The subject is one which has been the subject of representations at intervals by the Commander-in-Chief in India.

March 26*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

In accordance with the Address moved by Sir HENRY FOWLER on March 20th, a Return relative to East India (Income and Expenditure) was presented, and ordered to lie upon the Table.

POSTAL ORDERS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether Postal Orders issued in the United Kingdom were payable in Constantinople, Malta, and Gibraltar, but not in Australia, Canada, or other great colonies:

Whether Postal Orders issued in India, the Straits Settlements, and Newfoundland were payable in this country; while Postal Orders issued in this country were not payable in India, the Straits Settlements, Newfoundland, Canada, South Africa, or India:

And whether, in pursuance of an intimation previously given, he would consider the advisability of establishing a uniform exchange of Postal Orders between the Mother country and her colonies and dependencies.

Mr. HANBURY: The position was fully explained in answer to a question asked by the hon. member on the 21st of July, 1893, and as lately as the 27th of last month he was informed that the subject was engaging the Postmaster-General's attention.

MADRAS LAND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India if he would grant a Return of evictions, sales for recovery of land revenue, and other matters regarding the Madras land revenue administration in the form in which notice had been given.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have not at present the information asked for by the hon. baronet, but if he wishes it, I will write to the Government of Madras and request them to furnish it.

THE INDIAN MINTS.

Mr. KIMBER asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether, before making any international engagement on the subject of re-opening the Indian mints and keeping them open for free coinage of silver, he would give the House and country the opportunity of considering the proposals and their effect:

And whether he could obtain information through any of the Government departments as to what was the amount of silver now lying idle in the treasuries of the United States, and of France and Germany respectively.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I should be unwilling to pledge the Government on the subject mentioned in the question. It will be remembered that the principal alteration in our system which was promised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in relation to an international agreement had reference to the opening of the Indian mints. Now the Indian mints were closed without the consent of Parliament, and I do not know why Parliament should be consulted if the mints were again opened. With regard to the second paragraph, I have no official information at my disposal which would enable me to give with any feeling of security the question put to me by my hon. friend. But so far as I can make out, there are at present in the treasury of the United States ninety-six millions sterling of silver, against which there are notes in circulation for the whole amount less eight millions. That is to say, there are eighty-eight millions of silver notes against ninety-six millions of silver in the treasury. In Germany there are no returns issued of which I am able to avail myself. As to France, on March 19th last there were fifty millions of silver in the Bank of France, but notes were issued against the whole of this amount.

Mr. KIMBER: The right hon. gentleman has not answered my question as to whether, before entering into any engagement, the Government will give the House and the country an opportunity of considering the proposal.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought I had indicated to my hon. friend that I did not propose to give any pledge on the subject. As far as my experience goes, the House of Com-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

mons always finds some opportunity for discussing any matter of interest. But I should not like to pledge the Government to bring the question before the House before they arrived at a decision.

March 27th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA (INCOME AND EXPENDITURE).

The Return presented yesterday, relative to East India (Income and Expenditure), was ordered to be printed.

INDIAN MUTINY VETERANS.

In the discussion of the Army Estimates, in Supply, on the vote for £1,357,800 for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, Colonel MURRAY asked whether there were any men who had served in the Crimea and Indian Mutiny still remaining who had not received a pension?

Mr. BRODRICK said that as to Crimean and Indian Mutiny men, the present regulations had been drawn so that undoubtedly a considerable number of men who had served in the Crimea were necessarily excluded, but so far from it being the case that there were few of those old soldiers, he showed that at the last computation there were 16,000 of them still in existence. If they proceeded, however, to pension the whole number, it would entail a charge of something like a million. For that reason the War Office had gone as far as it could to induce the Treasury to meet the hardest cases, and those were now coming in at the rate of fifty to a hundred per month.

Major RASCH suggested that it would be politic to enlarge the operation of the system which applied to the Crimean and Indian Mutiny men. Some of those men had failed to obtain allowances from the War Office, and the fact that some of those men were to be seen walking about the streets with medals begging their bread, he believed acted as a deterrent to recruiting. The system of compassionate allowances was well enough as far as it went, but he submitted that it did not go far enough.

Mr. BRODRICK said he should be only too glad to make any concession, but the difficulty was that these men were all men who might have continued their service for pensions but had not done so. The authorities had been most anxious to meet these hard cases, but to go beyond what had been done at present was more than they could properly ask the Treasury to undertake.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN presumed that the large number of men quoted included every man that could be counted. But a great many of these men had given but a small degree of service which could be called Crimean or Mutiny service. Many of them had gone out to the Crimea or to India at the last moment, and had come back without seeing any service at all. He imagined that the reason why the compassionate allowances were established by his predecessor at the War Office, and a service of ten years made one of the conditions, was in order to be certain that the recipient had given some substantial service to the country. These men all deliberately renounced the opportunity of serving on for pension, and therefore they had really no legitimate claim on the Army Fund, but with the view of preventing the scandal of seeing men who had served substantially and well in the Crimea in distressed circumstances and hanging about the streets, compassionate allowances were made. The limits of that fund had been stretched as far as possible, and if they went any further he thought they might as well throw open the door and say that any long-service man in the Army should get a compassionate allowance.

The vote was agreed to.

INDIAN COOLIES.

On the vote on account for £10,350,000, Mr. J. A. PEASE moved to reduce the vote by £200 in order to call attention to the policy of the Government on the East Coast of Africa in relation to the question of slavery.

In the course of the debate Mr. GEORGE CURZON said: The hon. member seems to think that by a stroke of the pen you can import Indian coolies into Zanzibar to take the place of slave labour. I find that under existing regulations the Indian Government not only have it in their power, but they would be most reluctant to allow Indian coolies to serve under Arab employers. But even if this difficulty were overcome, you have all the questions arising out of the hiring of coolies, of their transportation, of the organisation of free labour, of the condition of the buildings in which they are to live, of medical supervision, and of hospitals for their careful tending. You have to see whether the employers could employ the men and pay them their wages. There will be the further danger that the large number of slaves who will take advantage of the abolition of the legal status may constitute a great temptation to the slave-owners on the mainland, and, whereas it can now be attempted, and with very remarkable success, to stop the importation of slaves from the mainland to the island, you have a serious reflux in the opposite direction—from the island to the mainland. Again, the bulk of the planters are unfortunately in the hands of usurers, who act in the most extortionate manner. The bulk of the estates are heavily mortgaged, and, supposing you diminish the labour supply in the way I have been speaking of, you would have these usurers in many cases foreclosing on the estates, and exacting, as far as they could, the utmost farthing. I submit we have no right to hand over a class, many of whom are exercising a legal right, to absolute ruin.

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

On the same vote Mr. REGINALD MCKENNA called attention to affairs in Siam, with special reference to the recent Anglo-French declaration and its influence upon this country. He reminded the Committee of the position in 1893, when the treaty was entered into between France and Siam, by which a certain part of the latter country was surrendered to France. The British Government, by means stronger than words, asserted its interest in the integrity of Siam. We sent more than one gunboat into Siamese waters, not only to protect British industry in Bangkok, but to demonstrate British interests in the integrity of Siam. He quoted a letter addressed by the Singapore Chamber of Commerce to Lord Rosebery, warning the late Prime Minister that if the two provinces of Siem-rap and Patabang were wrested from Siam, a serious blow would be dealt at our trade, and heavy duties would be imposed. The present Under Secretary, too, speaking in 1893, after a personal visit, stated that the possession of the provinces was essential to Siam, and that the independence and integrity of the country would be irretrievably injured if they were allowed to pass into the hands of any foreign power. It was perfectly true, he said, that under the Anglo-French declaration the provinces of Siem-rap and Patabang had not been in so many words surrendered to France; but, to show that they had been practically surrendered, he had only to point to the words of the right hon. gentleman, the Under Secretary. He found that in 1893, when the French were already in possession of the town of Chantabun, the right hon. gentleman was considerably afraid that the possession of Chantabun by the French would lead to the acquisition of those provinces by that country. Now, the position as it existed then, however bad it was, had at any rate this advantage for the Siamese, that the British Government had declared its interest in the integrity of Siam. But under the declaration in question, the British Government had withdrawn its interest in the integrity of Siam as far as those two provinces were concerned. A forecast made by the right hon. gentleman that, if Great Britain did not preserve her interest in the integrity of Siam, those provinces would be lost to her, appeared to have been verified. The right hon. gentleman used words in a prophetic sense when, speaking of the occupation of Chantabun, he said: "I respectfully invite him (that was the late Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs) to keep his eye on Chantabun during the next few weeks and to pause until it has been evacuated before he congratulates the Government and the House upon having saved those provinces for the Siamese Government, and upon the fact that the French and Siamese question has been satisfactorily settled." He appealed to the right hon. gentleman to explain that language, in view of the fact that the French had still not evacuated Chantabun. He asked him whether, under these circumstances, he could reassure the Committee that the Anglo-French declaration did not, as a matter of fact, amount to an actual surrender of the two provinces mentioned.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Mr. CURZON in the course of his reply said: I welcome the opportunity of being permitted to say a few words upon the question of Siam. I am glad at last that the Government have been challenged in this House. (Hear, hear!) We have had a great deal of outside challenging by distinguished personages, and, notably, the late Prime Minister, who, commencing with a most moderate statement at the beginning of the Session, has emboldened himself speech by speech until, during the last few weeks, he has reached the point of talking of "the surrender of Siam." (Laughter.) If we had been guilty of any surrender of Siam I want to know what the deputy of the late Prime Minister, the right hon. gentleman opposite, has been doing during the last three months. (Hear, hear!) Parliament has been sitting since February 11, and if we have been guilty of this surrender of Siam, or even of British interests in Siam, why have we not had this question brought before the House——

Sir C. DILKE: I myself and two other hon. members raised it on the Address.

Mr. CURZON: Yes, but why have we not had it raised by official representatives on that Bench; why have we not had a formal Vote of Censure moved; why have we not had a day asked; why have we not had the adjournment of the House moved? (Cheers.) Why am I now to get up in the House and answer the mild speech which we have heard from the hon. gentleman opposite? (Laughter.) I wait to hear repeated in this House, or anywhere else where we can answer, not on the public platform, the charges against Her Majesty's Government for having sacrificed either British or Siamese interests, and when those charges are made I shall be ready to answer them. It is my duty, however, to deal with the specific points raised by the hon. member. His question is—"Why was the guarantee of Siam secured by the declaration limited, why did it not extend to the whole of the Siamese dominions?" We should have been glad to have guaranteed the whole of Siam; we were willing to give such a guarantee ourselves, but we were unable to procure it. The obstacle was that by the Treaty of 1893 Siam had ceded to France certain privileges and had been deprived of other privileges in that part of the country which lay outside the Menam basin. We accepted the *status quo*, but there was a special reason why the Menam basin was selected. It was stated by Lord Salisbury in his accompanying despatch that it was a part of Siam in which British trade is chiefly interested. Out of the whole of the British subjects in Siam, of whom there were over 10,000, a large proportion were miners, pedlars, shopkeepers, and small traders engaged in that part of the country. If we look at the question from the point of view of Siam itself, it is true that on the map the superficial area of the Mekong basin is perhaps greater than the Menam basin, but that gives no idea of the value of the territory; it only gives a notion of the extent. In order that the Committee may learn what the Menam watershed is as against the Mekong watershed, let me point out that out of 7,000,000 people in Siam, 5,000,000 live in the Menam basin. The export of rice from that part of the country is £2,000,000 a year, and teak £75,000; so that the area which we have guaranteed to France is on the one hand that part of the kingdom which is most important to British interests, and, on the other, most essential to the security, prosperity, and development of Siam. I pass to the next point. The hon. member in speaking of the provinces of Patabang and Ankor gave currency to a popular illusion, which it is most desirable should be corrected in this House. It is the illusion that under this agreement there has been what may be called a partition of Siam, that is to say, the creation and guarantee of a central zone and the erection of two spheres of influence possibly at some future day in possession on either side of the French on the east and the British on the south-west. I have often heard of the faculty that is possessed by ingenious persons of reading interpretations into treaties and Acts of Parliament which were not in the minds of the original designers; and I must say that it is the most ingenious, almost the most unscrupulous exegesis to read any such interpretation as that which the hon. member has suggested in this declaration before the House. Siamese rights remain intact over the whole of their dominions. They have not been added to and they have not been impaired by this dominion. France has not gained and Great Britain has not gained a single right under this agreement beyond those which either possessed before. If there should be any doubt I would refer hon. members to the view of Lord Salisbury declared in his accompanying despatch: "It might be thought that because we have engaged ourselves and have received the engagement of France not under any circumstances to invade this territory, that therefore we are throwing doubt upon the complete title and rights of the Siamese to the remainder of their kingdom, or, at all events, treating those rights with disregard. Any such interpretation would entirely misrepresent the intention with which this arrangement has been signed. We fully recognise the rights of Siam to the full and undisturbed enjoyment, in accordance with long usage or with existing treaties, of the entire territory comprised within her dominions, and nothing in our present action would detract in any degree from the validity of the rights of the King of Siam to those portions of his territory which are now affected by this treaty." The French Minister for Foreign Affairs, in a speech made in the French Chamber on February 24, said, "If certain parts of the kingdom of Siam remain outside the clause of reciprocal neutralisation the omission must not be interpreted as implying the idea of a formal partition of these regions between the two contracting Powers." In a speech closing the debate on February 27, he spoke as follows: "All the territories of the kingdom of Siam situated outside the basin of the Menam remain in exactly the same position as they were before." If those were the declarations of the two Ministers who signed this agreement, I fail to see where the opportunity for the interpretation of the hon. member comes in. Then I come to the surrender of the trans-Mekong possession of Keng-cheng. The hon. member spoke about the sacrifice of this great waterway. What did he mean? The great waterway of the Mekong is a waterway which no steamer has ever mounted or ever will mount, because there are rapids in every few miles of its course. It has never been navigated, and never will be navigated; but even if it were navigable we have not sacrificed it. Then the hon. member says, "Why have you surrendered Keng-cheng?" and Lord Rosebery in his speeches has made a great point about this surrender of British territory. Then with reference to this small slice of territory, about the sacrifice of which so much has been said, Lord Rosebery himself was prepared to give it away in 1891 as far as the buffer State; indeed, he proposed not only to give away that part of the line over the river, but also the part that lies on this side of the river. Let the Committee consider what is the character and extent of this territory alleged to be so wrongly surrendered. It is a small physical protuberance on the frontier of India; no trade route runs through it; it is from 14 to 21 days' distant from the nearest British military post; and it is cut off from communication with Burmah and India during the rains. On the other hand this trans-Mekong possession had certain attractions for France; it was contiguous to her territories and she also was unwilling to give it up. In order, then, to secure an easy and intelligible frontier between the two countries this small excrescence of territory was surrendered. It is 1,250 square miles, mostly composed of mountains, with very few plains scattered between, and is inhabited by about 3,000 people only. This is the full extent of the great sacrifice and of the terrible surrender of British interests which has supplied Lord Rosebery with more than one platform peroration during the last two months. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Next, the Government have been asked why they did not by this agreement secure the evacuation by the French of Chantabun. Assurances have been given in this matter, and I am sure those assurances will not be lost sight of by the French Government. But I would again point out to the Committee that the question of Chantabun was regulated by the Convention between France and Siam in 1893. Our object was not to revise that Convention: it was a matter of agreement between France and Siam themselves. We accepted the then *status quo*, and the object we had in view was the security of Siam. The hon. member then went on to throw scorn upon the reciprocity of commercial advantages that had been granted in the provinces of Yun-nan and Szu-chuan, but I do not think that either England or France derives any special advantages from that part of the agreement. In one province France will have a slightly superior position, and in the other England will have a corresponding advantage. Commercial arrangements and reciprocity are the best possible guarantee that we can have for the development of this remote and interesting country without friction arising between two great countries trading with it. (Hear, hear.) I hope that in the few words I have said I have shown the Committee that in this matter there has been

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

no sacrifice of British interests on the one hand and no surrender of Siamese rights on the other. (Hear. hear.) I would here remind the hon. gentleman opposite that, while we have had Lord Rosebery going up and down the country talking of the surrender of Siamese territory and the sacrifice of British interests, the other night the right hon. gentleman the member for the Montrose Burghs, in his speech about Egypt, made the very important remark that he for one was delighted with the agreement relating to Siam. (Hear, hear.) In regard to British interests we have done that which ought to be the object of our policy in Siam, we abandoned the idea of creating a small and factitious buffer State in this remote region of the Upper Mekong—which was the object of the late Prime Minister—and we have given genuine protection to Siam by erecting for her a secure and intelligible frontier and this has been done without abrogating one tittle of the rights of Siam (Hear, hear.) After all, who are the persons, qualified to criticise or to express approbation of this Agreement? I imagine they are three in number only—the Siamese Government, the British traders in Siam, and the Indian Government. Well, the Siamese Government welcome the conclusion arrived at, and, on the whole, are satisfied with it; I have been in communication with British merchants and traders in Siam, and I can say on their behalf that they are satisfied with the Agreement; and I have reason to believe that the Indian Government are content with it. I wish to say before I sit down that I trust the remarks I have made will not be taken as implying that this Siamese Agreement is to be regarded as a British victory. I should be sorry to suggest any such view as that. For my own part I would prefer to eliminate from the consideration of the question all idea of conflict between two rivals such as England and France, in which one must necessarily be the gainer and the other the loser. I would regard it rather as a compromise, achieved, as all compromises must be, in a spirit of good will and concession.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT did not propose to go into the questions debated between the two eminent gentlemen who represented the present and the late Governments on this question; it was quite apparent that both those gentlemen took somewhat different views of the position of this country in regard to Siam when they were in opposition to when they were in office. There had undoubtedly been great concessions made to France in the last Siamese Convention. When the subject was raised in the first debate of the Session he refrained from going into that question because he hoped the concession to France was, to use the words of the hon. baronet, part of a large settlement, and that by making it we were on the point of obtaining some corresponding concession from the Government of France, and easing and mitigating in some degree various European and other difficulties with which we were confronted. He objected to the concession of the country of which Mongsin was the capital because, only a few months ago, the British representative promised the tribes around that country that the country should never be given up. Sometimes promises of that kind had to be broken, and he did not propose to go, on this occasion, closely into the question of the various points of the concession to France made in the last Siamese Convention. He was, however, much surprised to find the hon. baronet objected to the policy of the Government on this point, because he remembered the period when the Government for which the hon. baronet was responsible, made concession after concession with regard to Siam, and got absolutely no *quid pro quo*, in fact, it was undoubtedly the very grave blunders made by Lord Rosebery's Government in 1893 which had led to the present unfortunate condition of affairs in Siam. During the last two or three years we had made concessions to France in almost every quarter of the globe. We had abandoned not only this great territory in Siam, but the late Government gave up the whole of the Hinterland in Sierra Leone.

Sir G. DILKE said the Under Secretary of State, in his reply, had referred to the speech of the hon. member for Monmouthshire as a mellifluous speech. He thought that speech was a very good one, and put the case admirably. The right hon. gentleman had actually denied that night that the river Mekong flowed through the province of Yunan; he thought the right hon. gentleman, since he had come into office, must have lost that accurate knowledge of Siam which he once possessed.

Mr. CURZON said the right hon. member had misunderstood him.

Sir C. DILKE said the right hon. gentleman might forget what he had said; but it was as he had stated, and his hon. friend beside him was perfectly accurate in the statement he had made. He agreed with what had fallen from the late Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs as to this agreement. The right hon. gentleman the present Under Secretary had said that this treaty was popular with the Government of India, the Government of Siam, and the British merchants, and that those were the parties principally concerned. The Government might be to some extent satisfied with that part of the treaty which dealt with their side of Siam, but as regarded the other two parties, he doubted if the right hon. gentleman had represented the facts of the case. Although one or two traders having financial interests in the centre of Siam might have professed satisfaction with the treaty, he very much doubted whether the Chambers of Commerce were satisfied with the arrangements which had been made. He had read translations of the publications of the Siamese Government as to this agreement, and so far from expressing their satisfaction with this treaty, they said that they hoped for the best because they were advised by their Legations in Paris and London that nothing better could be done for them. The tone of that statement was not that of satisfaction. There were several clauses which were peculiar and exceptional in this treaty. There was the clause about Tunis, and about the Lower Niger, and it was difficult to explain why those clauses appeared in this treaty at all. Who was to be pleased by these clauses being put in? Arrangements with regard to the delimitation of our territory on the Lower Niger were taking place before this treaty was signed. The reason why the Tunis clause and the Niger clause were put into this Siamese arrangement must have been to make this thing more pleasant to French feeling than it would have been without these clauses. Of course, there were make-weights in the treaty in our favour. For instance, there were those clauses in it which gave us rights in China which France had obtained for herself under her treaty with China. The hon. gentleman had read to the Committee the actual words of the clauses, and showed that the rights conferred upon France by the terms of her treaty with China were rights that were peculiar to France and were limited to her alone, and that therefore they could not be transferred even by France herself to Great Britain. France had annexed to the treaty a declaration intended for home consumption, which showed that we could obtain no advantages under those rights so transferred to us. No doubt these clauses, which purported to embody the agreement arrived at between the two countries had been considered by Her Majesty's Government and the French Government, and had been drawn up with the view of pacifying the French, but he was afraid that that object had not been attained. With regard to Siam, the treaty had been entered into, and all that we could do now was to endeavour to make the best of it. One complaint he had to make was that the Foreign Office did not give the country the information with regard to the territories under its control that the Colonial Office did. If they had received as much information with regard to the Niger as they would if the territories had been under the control of the Colonial Office, they would have known more of the communications which had passed during the last few years between the Niger Company and the French Government.

Mr. H. LABOUCHERE said he did not know that he so entirely agreed with the right hon. gentleman sitting by his side with regard to the Siamese question as he did in regard to some other matters. This question of the frontiers, to use a vulgarism, never "caught on" in England, and, indeed, no one cared very much about it. Inasmuch as nobody seemed to know whence the Mekong came and whither it flowed, it did seem absolutely ridiculous to think that under the late Government we were within an inch of war upon some question as to the frontier that should be drawn on one side or other of this river. The right hon. gentleman opposite asked why it was that a vote of want of confidence had not been proposed from the Front Opposition Bench in regard to the action of the Government upon the Siamese question. The reason was that if anyone had got up on that Bench and moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government because they had come to what he called a reasonable settlement of this question, he would find himself in a minority, even on the Bench on which he sat. He congratulated the Government in having been wise in this matter, and his only regret was that they had not applied to other parts of the world the principle they had applied to the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

settlement of the Mekong difficulty. Complaint was made that although better relations had been established with France in Asia, the effect of that had been weakened by the action of Government elsewhere. He was sorry that was so; but still, he thought, so far, so good, and he was glad to think that if we were not entirely in harmony with France in Africa, at least, thanks to the present Government, we were in harmony with her in Asia. As to Siam, we had no more right to Siam than the French. First we took Lower Burma, then we took Upper Burma, and because we did so we came to the conclusion that we had special rights in Siam. If we acquired any rights in Siam for having stolen a province on one side, surely the French had acquired the same rights by stealing a province on the other side. (Laughter.) He would have preferred to see both the French and English Governments leave the Siamese to themselves. He was altogether opposed to European Governments going about in this grandiose way and annexing territories nominally in the interests of civilisation or Christianity, or for the purpose of putting down plurality of marriages—(laughter)—whereas, in reality, they wanted to steal other persons' goods. Both the English and French Governments had cast their eyes on this Naboth's vineyard, and he was, therefore, very glad that instead of foolishly going to war, the Government had come to a reasonable agreement in the matter. He had not the slightest idea as to the merits or any of the details of the question. He could not even follow the names of the different places alluded to; but he did say that whenever a Government—he did not care whether it was Liberal or Conservative—substituted for bullying and threatening and declarations of possible war, a fair and reasonable negotiation based on the give and take principle, with an ultimate proposal for arbitration, that Government would have his support.

Mr. REGINALD MCKENNA said that the right hon. gentleman opposite had attacked him for asserting that the Mekong was a possible waterway for commercial purposes. He now held in his hand a book, to a passage of which he would call the right hon. gentleman's attention. The book was published this year by a gentleman who had been in Siam and had been upon the Mekong himself, which was more, he believed, than the right hon. gentleman had done. He said:—"Bordering on the three Chinese provinces of Yun-nan, Kwang-si and Kwang-tung, and within easy reach of Szu-chuan, they possess in the two important waterways of the Songka and the Mekong unrivalled facilities for penetrating into the heart of China."

March 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MANUFACTURE OF CORDITE.

Colonel LOCKWOOD asked the Secretary of State for India whether any cordite had been manufactured in India for use by the troops there.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As yet no cordite has been made in India; but its manufacture is under consideration.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether any arrangements had been made by the Indian Government to afford an asylum in our territories, or in those under our influence, for the Siah Posh Kafirs who had escaped from the Afghan invaders:

Would the nature of any such arrangement be indicated to Parliament:

And whether His Highness, the Amír of Kabul, had caused 16,000 of the Kafirs to be deported and distributed amongst the local authorities in Afghanistan.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As I stated on the 20th February, certain Kafirs have sought refuge in Chitral, where they and others who have joined them are being assisted and settled upon small grants of land by the Mehtar on condition that they observe the usual terms on which asylum is granted. I have no information that is in any sense reliable as to the number of Kafir prisoners or the treatment of them in Afghan territory, but judging from what we know of the total number of the population of Kafiristan it is highly improbable that any such number of prisoners have been deported.

Sir C. DILKE: Is there no news since February, the date named by the noble lord?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I stated that since February 20th we had received information as to further attacks having been made. But all the figures which have been published in connexion with these attacks are supposed to be quite untrustworthy.

BRITISH SOLDIERS IN INDIA.

Mr. DUNCOMBE asked the Secretary of State for India, in reference to the alarming statements made in the Annual Report of the Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of India for 1894 as to the prevalence of venereal diseases in the Indian army, and which statements were admitted to be true, what steps he proposed to take to remedy the evil.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The growth of venereal disease in the Indian army consequent upon the abolition of the previous protective measures against it, has been a source of great concern to the Government of India, who report that it prevails "to such an extent as to constitute a most serious cause of inefficiency in the army." The Government of India are considering what instructions or regulations it may be possible for them to issue to mitigate this scourge, and without infringing the restriction imposed upon them by the Resolution passed by this House upon this subject.

Mr. DUNCOMBE: Is there any possibility of that Resolution being rescinded? (Ministerial cheers.)

No answer was returned.

April 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA LOANS.

East India (Loans raised in England).—Copy presented, of return of all loans raised in England chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended 31st March, 1896, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PETITION.

Maháráját Jalim Singh.—Petition from Jallahawad, for restoration to power; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention had been drawn to a proclamation published at page 215 of the *Natal Government Gazette* of the 25th February last, in which, under the heading "Rules and Regulations for the disposal of Erven," or sites, "in the township of Nondweni, Zululand," at clauses 4, 13, 18, 20, and throughout the proclamation, words were used which would effectually preclude all the British Indian subjects of Her Majesty from acquiring or occupying land within that township for purposes of business or residence, while enabling others, who were not subjects of Her Majesty but because they were "persons of European birth or descent," to do so; whether similar prohibitory provisions had been in force with regard to another township called Eshave since 1891; whether he was aware that only two years before that time, in 1889, British Indian subjects were not allowed to purchase land in the township of Melmoth to the value of nearly £2,000; and, if so, whether any cause had been shown for now precluding them from the exercise of a similar right in reference to the townships of Eshave and Nondweni; and whether, as such prohibition constitutes an interference with the right of British subjects to acquire property in any part of Her Majesty's dominions, based merely on the question of colour, and thereby constituting a direct violation of the gracious assurance given by Her Majesty to the people of India in 1858, he would take immediate steps to arrest legislation of this description by the Governments of Natal and other parts of Her Majesty's dominions in Africa, and order the elimination of all such regulations with regard to the townships of Eshave and Nondweni as preclude British Indian subjects from acquiring property therein.

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The proclamations relating to the townships of Nondweni and Eshave do, as stated by the hon. member, exclude those who are not of European birth or

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

descent from purchasing or holding land, but the purchase of land by British Indians at Melmoth in 1889 does not appear to have been reported to the Colonial Office. I have been informed that a petition on the subject from the Indian community of Natal, dated March 11th, is on its way, and I propose to give the subject my careful attention when the petition arrives.

LASCAR SEAMEN.

In Committee of Supply on the Vote to complete the sum for Post Office packet services,

Mr. W. Allen asked how it was that the one line of Steamship Companies which employed almost exclusively Lascar seamen got the whole patronage of the Post Office in the matter of over-sea mail contracts. The "Fair Wages" Resolution required that a fair rate of wages should be paid by those who secured Government contracts, but these Lascar seamen were employed at a rate of wages which English seamen would not for a moment accept. The Government were in a specially advantageous position for dealing with this matter because they had a director of the P. and O. among themselves.

Mr. James Lowther said that the Government were asked to prevent the employment of British subjects. ("No, No!")

Mr. John Burns: It would save time if I point out that the difference between the right hon. gentleman and myself is not so large as his speech would indicate. I did not ask for the total exclusion of Lascars and coolies who were subjects of the British Empire. What I protested against was the proportionately large number of Lascars and coolies employed on British steamers which received subsidies from the Post Office.

Mr. James Lowther said, that if the hon. member confined his suggestions to the limited extent of the non-employment of persons who were not subjects of the Queen, he was with him. But he should not be prepared to draw a distinction between one British subject and another in a matter of this kind. He thought that a much healthier public opinion prevailed now than was the case some time ago with regard to those subjects. He did not think that they would be met by the old argument that the interests of the consumer and the taxpayer should be solely considered. He hoped it would be acknowledged that the duty of the Government was first of all to protect the interests of British subjects, and not the supposed interest of the taxpayer, at the expense of the larger interests of the Empire as a whole. He trusted that the Government would give an assurance that the spirit of the Fair Wages Resolution would be enforced in respect of shipping contracts and the employment of persons who were not British subjects. Was it the case that payments were made to shipping companies other than those which sailed under the British flag? If the contracts were knocked down to the lowest bidder, and foreign steamship companies were to obtain the money of the British taxpayer, he should look upon the policy as most mischievous. The Government should, therefore, take care that in the disposal of Government contracts the interests of British labour and truly British interests were jealously safeguarded.

Mr. A. Griffith-Boscawen said, that the hon. member for Battersea had raised a very important question, and he thought it was a matter on which Conservatives ought to support him. He had travelled on steamship lines on which English labour alone was employed, and by those, like the P. and O., which employed a great deal of Lascar labour. [Mr. J Lowther: "British subjects."] No, not all of them. At all events a great deal too many Lascars were employed, and it was little short of a scandal when they were deploring the disappearance of British sailors all over the world, that as much encouragement as possible should not be given to their employment, at least in those steamship lines which received heavy Government subsidies. It had always appeared to him to be wrong that the P. and O. Company should have a large preponderance of contracts, and at the same time should be allowed, notwithstanding the protest of the colonies, and other parts of the Empire, to employ a vast amount of foreign coloured labour on their ships. They ought not to exclude the labour of their fellow subjects, even if it be coloured labour. The P. and O. Company had contracts between this country and India and Australia. He could not see that it was a hardship to employ Lascar labour provided it was the labour of our own subjects carrying the mails to India; but it was a hardship if such labour was employed on ships going to Australia. The Orient line employed labour only. Their ships were excellently managed and gave satisfaction to the colonials and others. The colonials held a strong opinion that the P. and O. ships should be manned by British labour only, exactly as the Orient ships were. He hoped that the next time the contracts were made the Government would insist, as far as the Australian contracts were concerned, that the views of the colonials were attended to. There should be a clause inserted that only British and Australian labour should be employed on all the mail steamships in future.

Mr. A. D. Provand asked the right hon. gentleman to appoint a Committee without delay to take into consideration the whole question of these mail contracts. The Committee of 1849 said in their Report that when tenders for carrying mails were asked for, ample notice and full particulars of the terms and conditions of the service required should be given to the public, as that was the most likely way to secure real tenders by responsible bodies. In 1877, the then Postmaster General gave a pledge that ample time would be given to competitors to send in offers to carry out the service then required, but in flagrant violation of that pledge, when the tenders were asked for only a month's notice was given. No new firm could possibly prepare to tender in so short a time as that. It appeared as if the Post Office intended to pursue the same tactics now. In 1885 and 1886 the same thing was done but in another way. The Post Office first of all asked for a tender for seven years, and when tenders were sent in they altered the proposed seven years' contract to a ten years' contract. But they gave no notice of the alteration to the various tenderers and merely notified it to one—the P. and O. Company. They asked that Company to tender again for the ten years' service, and of course, in the circumstances, no competition was possible. In the present case there was only an interval of two years before the new service must commence. There were no doubt, some difficulties in connection with the tenders for the Australian service, because the colonial governments joined with us in paying the subsidy; but there were no difficulties of the kind in connection with the Eastern service to India and China, because that was paid for exclusively by ourselves. The new contract, if it was to be for ten years, would involve a very heavy outlay. At present the P. and O. Company received £1,000 of public money daily for carrying the mails. The subject was one which ought to be referred at once to a Parliamentary Committee composed of business men. A Departmental Committee would be useless; in fact, nobody would dream of paying any attention to the decision of a Departmental Committee, considering the way in which the Department itself had behaved on former occasions. Allusion had been made to the black men employed in P. and O. steamers. These came from Abyssinia and various parts on the Red Sea, and were not British subjects. At the Post Office simple business matters were transacted in a way that made one think that the officials had no business knowledge at all, and their methods were very bad for the taxpayers. The action of the Post Office in the past had resulted in the establishment of a monopoly for the benefit of the P. and O. Company, and unless the Department invited tenders now under reasonable conditions, that monopoly would be maintained.

Mr. T. M. Healy, in the course of his speech, said that with regard to the employment of Lascars, he would remind the Committee that in a sailor pluck and courage were desirable. Something more was wanted than mere readiness to serve for eighteenpence a day.

Mr. R. B. Haldane said that, as regarded the Fair Wages Resolution, he was entirely at one with his hon. friend the member for Battersea; but questions of fair wages had nothing whatever to do with questions of nationality. He noticed with some concern that the right hon. gentleman the member for Thanet seized hold of the Fair Wages Resolution to bring in the question of the employment of foreign labour. His own opinion emphatically was that this question of fair wages had nothing in the world to do with the employment of foreign seamen, though, of course, administrative considerations might arise in connection with the subsidising of a great line of mercantile marine ships. He trusted that the right hon. gentleman would not say that those on his side of the House, at any rate, desired that the Government should embark on a policy of excluding in all its contracts the employment of any sort of foreign labour. At the same time he hoped it would be made perfectly clear that there was no disposition in the House of Commons to go back on the principle of the Fair Wages Resolution.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Sir THOMAS SUTHERLAND, in the course of his speech, said that in the first place he wished to disabuse the minds of hon. members who had listened to the hon. member for Battersea, with regard to one question—namely, that mixed crews were made use of from a motive of economy. He could assure the House that that was not the case. As a matter of fact, mixed crews were in reality considerably more costly than entirely European crews. The type of vessel which carried the mails to India or Australia would carry upwards of 200 hands—about 220. Of that number upwards of 80 would be Europeans or Englishmen, and the balance would be composed entirely of Lascars or Africans.

Mr. BURNS: Portuguese.

Sir CHARLES DILKE: Are you including stewards?

Sir T. SUTHERLAND: Yes; stewards and engineers. The cost of such a crew would be actually greater than the cost of an entirely European crew, which, however, would of course be smaller in point of numbers. This matter had to be dealt with from the point of view of practicability, and those who had to deal with it were confronted with the fact that in navigating the Eastern seas European labour was by no means so efficient as that which was made use of. To show that what he said was not spoken without experience, he might mention that when the Company with which he was connected began to run their vessels through the Suez Canal, they manned their ships with European crews; and the reason why they abandoned that practice and took to employing mixed crews was that they found the European crew in the Indian and China seas were not nearly so efficient as they were in European waters. He did not say it would not be possible to secure efficient European crews in the case of ships navigating the Australian seas; but the reason why ships so engaged were run with mixed crews was that they could not be retained for service with one particular line, and must take their share in all the work the Company had to do. The experience of his Company with British seamen was very unfortunate, for it was by no means a rare thing, when first they began to run through the Suez Canal, for a ship to arrive at her destination, Calcutta for instance, with half her crew in gaol. If the House of Commons chose to pass a law to prevent the employment of Lascars, it would not be of the smallest consequence so far as his interests were concerned; but so far as the navigation of ships in the Eastern seas at a high rate of speed was concerned, it would be a matter of the greatest possible importance. He could not conceive how the House could possibly attempt to interfere with the employment of British subjects as sailors any more than as soldiers. He contended that the training of the Lascars was as good, if not better, than the great majority of men now employed in steam vessels. It was a well-known fact in maritime history that when the Charter of the East India Company came to a close, the vast trade then existing, and which had increased so much now, fell into the hands of a class of vessel which was manned exclusively by Lascars; and the Company with which he was connected, when it first started on its very considerable enterprise in the Far East, obtained its whole staff from these ships. He trusted he would do no harm by thus stating what were the actual facts of the case—namely, that motives of economy had nothing whatever to do with the employment of Lascars, and that the system of entirely European crews had been tried and found unsuccessful. If they were to deal with this question from the point of view of the fair wages resolution, how would it work out? They had two sets of men employed upon these vessels. The vessels started in one direction from England and in the other from India, and there could be no doubt whatever that the men starting from England were paid the wages current in the trade. The point was whether the wages current in the trade in England should apply to the men starting from India and who were natives of India. If that were done, it must shut out all the latter from employment in this service. Would it be fair in this way indirectly to exclude their British fellow-subjects? (Hear, hear.) They must recollect too, that a large portion of this subsidy—namely, something like £72,000—and, therefore, a large part of the wages of the sailors, was paid by India. In these circumstances, it would not be fair to lay down a rule which would shut out of the service of these vessels their fellow-subjects in the Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.)

Sir CHARLES DILKE observed that there was one point upon which the Secretary to the Treasury had been silent in his reply, and that was as regarded the military argument. No doubt it was not the right hon. gentleman's business; but it was the business of the House, and the First Lord of the Admiralty ought to be consulted on the matter in that respect before the senders were settled. The country had a reserve of really good British seamen, only in the passenger lines, which were very largely mail contract companies. The Cunard and other lines running across the Atlantic, and great lines such as the Orient, were the homes of good British seamen, and the nominal force of British sailors in the world was merely a nominal force except as far as these great companies were concerned. They were told they had great numbers of British seamen, but the numbers included stewards and all classes of people and even loafers. He believed he himself figured in these returns, because if a passenger travelled by a steamer which was not a passenger steamer, he was bound before he could so travel to ship as a member of the crew. He knew that on one occasion a distinguished *Times* correspondent, Miss Shaw, had been borne as a British seaman because she had to ship in a non-passenger steamer in travelling to a distant part of the world. The real reserve of British seamen was to be found in the great passenger and naval lines. As regarded the further East where, undoubtedly, they might need many of these fast cruisers suddenly in the time of war, they would have to face the Messageries steamers which were manned almost exclusively by French men-of-war men. He was bound to say, with all respect to the very high qualities of Lascar crews, that they could not look to a Lascar crew to man one of their fast steamers in time of war so as to enable her to compete on equal terms with French steamers manned by men-of-war men. The officers of the mail carrying steamers in most cases belonging to the Naval Reserve, but the crews under them were composed of Lascars. The Chairman of the P. and O. talked about mixed crews. They were not mixed in that sense of the word. The Europeans on board were the officers and the quartermasters, but there were no European seamen on board the ships at all which were manned by Lascars. He hoped before the contracts were renewed some arrangement would be come to between the Admiralty, and the Board of Trade and the Treasury as to what, in future, should be the composition of their crews. He quite agreed with the Secretary to the Treasury, it was impossible to make any rule excluding Lascars, and no doubt this matter would be settled by a compromise of some kind on that head. But when the Secretary to the Treasury suggested that the P. and O. get these contracts, as against the Orient line because they were cheaper, then he had to reply that that cheapness was affected by the extent to which the P. and O. relied on exclusively Lascar crews, and the military argument was one which in this connection, ought not to be excluded.

Mr. J. H. DALZIEL observed that the Secretary to the Treasury had not, in his reply, stated, so far as the different companies were concerned, that the P. and O. got the particular contract after competition with opposing companies.

Mr. HANBURY: I believe that is so.

Mr. DALZIEL hoped that they would hear before the debate closed whether the right hon. gentleman adhered to that statement, and that it was not a matter of private influence and private arrangement. Another point was whether it was desirable that Lascars should be so employed. There was a very curious contradiction between the statement of the hon. member for Greenock and that of the Secretary to the Treasury. The former said it was not on the ground of economy these men were employed, but the right hon. gentleman on following entirely threw over the hon. member and said that undoubtedly there was economy in this matter, and that the Lascars were cheaper.

Sir T. SUTHERLAND explained that his statement was that on these ships a far larger number of Lascars were employed than if the ships were manned by European seamen; and that the total amount of wages paid on one of the steamers manned by a mixed crew was larger in twelve months than if it were manned exclusively by Europeans.

Mr. DALZIEL observed that after this explanation he could not, he was afraid, alter the view he had expressed. The hon. member said the employment of these men was not defended on the ground of economy, while the right hon. gentleman said that undoubtedly the wages paid to them were less in proportion than those given to British seamen. The right hon. gentleman [illegible] said that as India contributed a certain amount of the subsidy it would be unfair to prohibit the em-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ployment of natives of India. Quite so, but as the right hon. gentleman was willing to pay some deference to the opinion of India in the matter, why did he not carry out that view with regard to Australia? Whilst Australia contributed her proportion in the same way as India, the Australian people complained that their workmen were practically prevented from being employed on board these steamers. He thought there was a still more important view of this question, which was that the Secretary to the Treasury in a Conservative Government returned as the representatives and champions of British labour, should give a special pleading in favour of the employment of Lascars, because he could not come to any other conclusion. The right hon. gentleman did not give one hint that this subject would be reconsidered or that anything would be done when the contracts came to be considered. Thus they had the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists, who in every constituency throughout the country issued bills containing the words "British Seamen, British Boilers, British Ships," when a question was raised affecting British seamen remaining silent in this great cause.

Mr. HANBURY: I distinctly stated that coolies were not employed, that all these were British subjects and I am not aware of any member on this side having said anything against putting our fellow British subjects in India in possession of a share of the privileges which we enjoy.

Mr. DALZIEL said that he entirely agreed with the right hon. gentleman. The right hon. member for Battersea did not claim that an undue exception should be made on behalf of British seamen, but what he asked was that an undue preference should not be given to Lascars simply because they worked for less wages than did British seamen. It was not a question of preference. All they asked was that they should have fair consideration in this matter. They had not only not had fair consideration, but they had not had anything approaching it. He was told that, so far as the P. and O. was concerned, two-thirds of the men employed were actually Lascars: and here they were asked to vote a sum, some £360,000 of which went to this Company, without a word of promise from the representative of the Government that this matter was going to receive attention. He hoped his hon. friend would go to a division, and then they would see how some of the hon. members opposite who, thoughout the country increased their majorities and won seats on a "British platform," would vote on this particular matter.

Mr. B. L. COHEN (Islington, E.) said he could inform the hon. gentleman at once how he should vote. If the hon. member for Battersea went to a division, he should vote against him. He was sorry that for the first time for a great many years an effort should be made from the opposite side of the House to import party spirit and party considerations into such a pure question of administration. He was not at all afraid to meet the hon. gentleman fairly and squarely on the issue he had raised. So far as he knew it had never been one of the planks of the Conservative and Liberal Unionist platform that they should seek to exclude from employment by the State the subjects of any portion of Her Majesty's dominions. It had been, perhaps almost exclusively, the doctrine of the Conservative and Liberal Unionist party to advocate Imperial interests as distinguished from anything which would tend to disruption and separation. If there was any vote in respect of which special consideration should be given to Lascars, surely it was the vote for that particular company—in which he was not directly or indirectly pecuniarily interested—which had done so much, by the improvement of the communication between the Indian Empire and the United Kingdom, to better the lot of the hundreds of millions of Her Majesty's Indian subjects. He understood his right hon. friend to say spontaneously that, although they could not, should not, and would not consent to the exclusion of Lascar labour, they did recognise that the subjects from the Australian colonies should receive their due share of employment on the lines engaged in those services. The hon. gentleman who had just spoken had instituted a comparison between the Orient line and the P. and O., but he did not seem to know that the Orient line carried no mails to India; while the P. and O. not only carried mails to India, but a large portion of the mails for Australia were carried on those vessels which were destined for Calcutta and Bombay. On the general question, he would like to say that he thought it was a little dangerous, quite apart from the question of Lascars or British seamen, for the Government of this country to interfere too much, or at all, in matters of administration between employers and employed. These subjects should be left to the contracting parties. He believed the duty of the Government was to let their contract on terms most advantageous to the British taxpayer, having regard to all the considerations which surrounded the granting of those contracts.

April 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "IMPERIAL" INSTITUTE.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India had largely increased their contribution to the Imperial Institute; and, if so, would he state the purpose for which the grant was made, and its total amount, and see that the money was devoted strictly to promoting the interests of Indian arts, industries, and economic resources by the expenditure being entrusted to a body of experts acting in consultation with Sir Frederick Abel, and not to the ordinary administrative officials of the Imperial Institute:

And whether he would place on the Table any correspondence that had passed on the subject between the Government of India, the India Office, and the Imperial Institute.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Government of India have increased their contribution to the Imperial Institute from £500 to £750 a year, with the object of promoting the interests mentioned in the hon. member's question. A committee of gentlemen of Indian experience has been appointed to co-operate with the staff of the Institute and to secure the application of this contribution to the purposes for which it was intended. I shall have no objection to the publication of the correspondence which has passed on this subject if the hon. member will move for it.

April 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government intended to bring troops from India to Suakin or elsewhere to join in the Egyptian expedition:

And whether he would secure that no part of the expenses was laid upon the Indian exchequer.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no reason to believe that the Egyptian army will prove inadequate to the task it has in hand; and, until such assistance as is suggested in the question is required, it is obviously premature to discuss the incidence of its cost.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether any Indian troops of Her Majesty were under orders to go to the Sudan:

And, whether, if troops of Her Majesty were employed either to defend that portion of the Sudan now occupied by Egyptian troops or to replace any other portion of it now governed by the Kailifa under the rule of Egypt, the cost would be defrayed by Egypt or by this country.

Mr. CURZON: The first part of the question has already been answered in the negative by the Secretary of State for India. In reply to the second, should it be found necessary to employ British troops beyond Wady Halfa the cost of such operations will be matter for consideration and discussion between the British and Egyptian Governments.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Do I understand that no action will be taken until the House has an opportunity of pronouncing on the matter?

Mr. CURZON: No such inference can be drawn from the reply in the form in which I have given it. (Laughter).

Mr. DALZIEL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the 9th Lancers were under orders to proceed to the Sudan; and whether the Government adhered to their declaration that no British troops would be employed in the expedition to Dongola.

Mr. CURZON: There is no foundation for the report that the 9th Lancers are under orders to proceed to the Sudan. In reply to the second part of the question, I have nothing to add to or to substract from the reply which I gave to the hon. member for Newcastle-under-Lyme on the 27th of March.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

April 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

MADRAS VILLAGE SERVICE ACT.

Madras Proprietary Estates Village Service (No. 2) Act, 1894.—Petition from Madras, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

THE DURAND TREATY.

A BLUNDER OF THE "FORWARD SCHOOL."

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in the recent Afghan operations, an invasion had taken place of portions of the Bashgal Valley, formerly tributary to Chitral, and without the sphere of influence of the Amír as settled by the Durand Treaty, they being also within the countries visited by Sir G. Robertson after the conclusion of that treaty:

And why the agreement with the Amír of Afghanistan, dated 12th November, 1893, published in the *Standard*, and in India in the *Bombay Gazette* of 21st March, and other papers, as laid before Parliament, had not been circulated to members.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In the Durand Treaty it was originally proposed that the whole of the Arnawai Bashgal Valley should remain within the sphere of influence of the Indian Government. When the delimitation began in the field it was found that the Bashgal and Arnawai Valleys ran in different directions, the Arnawai draining into the Kunar from the east and the Bashgal River from the west. The frontier was therefore revised, and the revision placed within the sphere of influence of the Amír the Bashgal Valley, which is west of the Kunar River, and over which the Mehtars of Chitral have claimed rights. This included part of the country visited by Sir G. Robertson in 1890 and 1891.

The delay in circulating the papers which I laid on the Table on the 27th of March has been partly due to a misunderstanding, which I regret, and partly to the Easter holiday. The final order to circulate was issued to the printers on Monday last, and the book will be in the hands of members to-morrow I believe.

Mr. BIRRELL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the version of the Durand Agreement with the Amír of Afghanistan, published in the *Standard* of 1st April, 1896, and in other papers, was correct; if so, whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government had been called to the violation of the third article of that Agreement last November and December, when the Bashgal Valley was entered and taken possession of by Afghan troops, notwithstanding the stipulation that the Amír should not exercise interference therein.

Whether Her Majesty's Government would take steps to secure the restitution of the territory thus improperly acquired, and such reparation as was now possible for the slaughter and enslavement of the many thousands of Kafirs in a district which was specially included within the British dominions.

And, whether he would inform the House as to any action that had been taken by Her Majesty's Government on behalf of the people in those portions of Kafiristan which, by the Durand Agreement, had been assigned to the rule of the Amír.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My reply to the question put by the right hon. member for the Forest of Dean answers all the questions put by the hon. member except the last. As regards the last I stated in reply to the hon. member for Darlington, on the 23rd of March, that the Viceroy would use any favourable opportunity of exercising his good offices on behalf of the Amír's Kafir subjects, and he is prepared to do so, but so far as I know no such opportunity has yet occurred.

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, if he had yet received the final decision of the Viceroy with regard to the deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar:

What opportunity had been afforded to His Highness to defend himself from the charges which had been brought against him:

And was he now able to lay upon the Table of the House any papers or correspondence relating to this matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The papers containing the decision of the Government of India have been received within the last few days at the India Office. The Mahárájá Rana first gave his explanations to the political agent, was next invited to give them in December to the Governor-General's agent, was finally allowed to send them direct to the Viceroy, and was at every stage of the enquiry invited to explain and defend himself.

I am considering what papers can be laid on the Table of the House in connection with this subject.

THE VILLAGE SERVICE ACT.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the district collectors of the Madras Presidency were opposed to the extension of the Village Service Act (which formerly applied only to Rayatwari villages) to Zemindari and Devastanam villages; and, if so, on what grounds:

Whether this extension of the Act was based on the assumption that certain abuses of power by village watchmen complained of by villagers in Tinnevelly were prevalent in Zemindari and Devastanam villages:

Whether, on the Madras Landholders' Association pointing out that no such abuses prevailed in Zemindari and Devastanam villages, the Madras Government withdrew from the statement of objects and reasons the allegation on which the extension was founded, and yet proceeded to make that extension:

And whether, in view of the extreme unpopularity of this extension amongst the Madras landholders, he would request the Madras Government to reconsider the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Madras Government report that the "district officers of Madras almost, if not quite, unanimously feel the absolute necessity of bringing the village servants in Zemindaris under control, in the way provided by the Act. They conjecture that the statement to the contrary refers to opinions recorded in 1871-75 upon another proposal."

Since 1882 the necessity of bringing village servants in Zemindaris under control has been under discussion; the necessity was held to be general, and by no means confined to Tinnevelly villages.

I do not find that the differences in wording between the "Statement of objects and reasons," as first framed in February, 1892, and the Statement finally published with the Act give support to the suggestion in the third clause of the question.

As at present advised, I am not prepared to act upon the suggestion in the fourth clause of the question.

MAIL PACKET CONTRACTS.

Mr. PROVAND asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether he would agree to appoint a Select Committee of the House to consider the question of mail packet contracts for India, China, and Australia, and refer to it the tenders received in reply to the recent notices sent out calling for the same.

Mr. HANBURY said there were many objections to referring to a Select Committee tenders received for a mail packet service, and the House had already a very large control over those contracts before they were concluded. An inter-departmental committee had been appointed to make arrangements for the new contracts for the India, China, and Australian mail services, and the tenders for those services which had been recently invited would be considered by that Committee. No mail packet contract was binding till it had been approved by a resolution of the House.

April 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

KYTHAL STATE.

State of Kythal.—The petition of Cis Sutlej, for enquiry, was ordered to lie upon the Table.

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALAWAR.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would furnish any information to the House with regard to the recent deposition of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar, and place upon the Table correspondence from the Government of India in that connexion.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have already announced the decision of the Indian Government upon this question, and if my hon. friend will move for the correspondence I shall be glad to give it.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. LEWIS FRY asked the Secretary of State for India whether any further number of the inhabitants of Kafiristan had taken refuge in Chitral since the statement made by him to the House on the 28th February; and, if so, what arrangements had been made for them:

Whether any representation in favour of the Kafirs had been made to the Amír of Afghanistan since the renewal of hostilties at the beginning of last month:

And, whether any answer had been received from His Highness on the subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In answer to the first question, my information is that only two sons of a Lutdeh headmen have taken refuge in Chitral since March 1st.

In reply to the other questions, the latest information in the possession of the Viceroy is to the effect that the Amír has directed his officers to treat the Kafirs leniently, and not to convert them against their will. He has also prohibited traffic in Kafir slaves. No opportunity has therefore presented itself to the Viceroy for addressing the Amír on the subject.

DISEASE IN THE ARMY.

Mr. PRICE asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether his attention had been drawn to the favourable report of the Surgeon-General with Her Majesty's forces in India on the method of treating contagious disorders introduced to the Army by Surgeon-Captain F. J. Lambkin, A.M.S.:

And, whether, having regard to the serious spread of such disorders in the Army both at home or abroad, and the grave consequences both to the men and to the efficiency of the service, he would take steps to further investigate the value of the treatment, and, if found satisfactory, to extend its use.

Mr. BRODRICK: In the limited number of cases in which the treatment has been applied it has given good results; but I am informed that the remedy is not new. Further investigation will, however, be made, and if satisfactory results are obtained the system will probably be extended.

In answer to Mr. STUART,

Mr. BRODRICK said: It is the fact that, as regards the Army at home, the admissions for venereal disease, though still very high, have been lower in 1894 than in any year since 1879.

April 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DURAND TREATY.

East India (North-West Frontier, Bashgal Valley).—Copy presented of Agreement signed by Mr. R. Udney, C.S.I., and Sipar Salar Ghulam Haidar Khan, joint commissioners for laying down the Afghan boundary from the Hindu Kush Range to Nawa Kotal, and confirmed by H.H. the Amír of Afghanistan on the 19th December, 1895 [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

THE "IMPERIAL" INSTITUTE.

On the motion of Mr. BROWNAGGREE, an address was granted for "copy of correspondence relating to the contribution from Indian revenues to the Imperial Institute which has passed between the India Office, the Government of India, and the Imperial Institute."

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary of State for India, why a step of temporary rank had not been given to Majors and Captains holding the appointments of Commandant and second in command of regiments under the Government of India, the same as was given in the *London Gazette* of the 5th November, 1895, to officers holding similar appointments in regiments under the Commander-in-Chief in India:

And, what orders had been issued in India on the subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A few applications have recently been received for the grant of temporary rank to officers of the Hyderabad contingent, but for no others. I will communicate with the Government of India on the subject.

THE DURAND TREATY.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would at once lay before Parliament the revised agreement with the Amír of Afghanistan by which the Bashgal Valley was given to the Amír.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would place in the Library a *fac-simile* of the map referred to in clause 1 of the Durand Agreement as being attached to that agreement, and also a *fac-simile* of the detailed map referred to in clause 3:

Whether he would lay upon the Table a copy of any document which sets aside the provisions of clause 3, and transfers the Arnawai or Bashgal Valley from the British to the Amír's sphere of influence:

Whether he would state approximately the length and breadth of the Arnawai or Bashgal Valley; and in what other respects, if any, the Durand Agreement had been modified:

And whether he would recommend the Government of India to depute Colonel Holdich, the Boundary Commissioner, or other suitable officer, to superintend the removal of those Kafirs who were being expatriated, and secure for them humane treatment.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The maps referred to in the first question of the hon. baronet the member for Banffshire are inconvenient in size, and I have no spare copies, but I will have the line traced upon another map and place it in the Library.

I have here a copy of the agreement, dated April 9th, 1895, as signed by the Commissioners and subsequently ratified by the Amír, which I will lay on the Table.

I cannot give the information asked for in the third question at the present stage of negotiations.

In answer to the fourth question, I can only refer the hon. baronet to the reply given by me on March 23rd last to the hon. member for Darlington.

Sir C. DILKE: The noble lord speaks of the present state of the negotiations. Have we heard of any negotiations?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes, sir. After the Durand Convention was agreed to, an enquiry took place, and in certain places it was found that the topographical features of the country did not quite correspond with the terms of the Convention. Then various agreements have been entered into, and I think only two have been ratified by the Amír, including the one with regard to the Bashgal Valley. Further communications are going on with regard to the delimitation of territory in different parts of Beluchistan and Afghanistan.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: Is not the Valley of Bashgal a very large one, and estimated to contain 40,000 inhabitants?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Oh, no. I do not exactly know the dimensions of the valley, but the total population of the whole of Kafiristan, at an extreme estimate, is 90,000, and the Bashgal Valley occupies quite a small portion of the territory assigned to Kafiristan.

April 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CHITRAL PAPERS.

Sir HENRY FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any despatches or telegrams relating to the occupation of Chitral had been sent by the Secretary of State to the Government of India since the despatch of the Secretary of State of the 16th August, 1895:

And, if there had been any such despatches or telegrams, would he inform the House why they had been omitted from the Correspondence recently presented to Parliament.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No telegrams or despatches except those relating to details of unimportance have been sent to the Government of India since 16th August on the subject of Chitral.

On the day upon which the correspondence alluded to was laid upon the Table of the House, viz., 27th March, a despatch was sent to India dealing with proposals for reduction of military expenditure in Gilgit, but the correspondence on this point is not concluded, as further experience of the recent changes is necessary before final arrangements can be sanctioned. If the right hon. gentleman wishes it, I will gladly show him these despatches.

THE "IMPERIAL" INSTITUTE.

East India (Contributions by India to the Imperial Institute).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 21st April: Mr. BROWNAGGREE]; to lie upon the Table.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 4. JUNE, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from April 24th to May 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

April 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE "IMPERIAL" INSTITUTE.

East India (Contributions by India to the Imperial Institute).—Return (presented 23rd April) to be printed. (No. 151.)

KYTHAL STATE.

East India (Kythal).—Return (presented 11th February) to be printed. (No. 148.)

April 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COOLIES IN ASSAM.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information regarding the death rate of coolies employed in the coal mines of Assam:

Whether he was aware that the Calcutta press represent that rate to be very high, and also that a very large percentage were always on the sick list:

Whether the Indian Government had any information to show that this was caused by a forced change of diet to rice:

And whether the Government could make regulations enforcing the supply to immigrants of the same kind of food they had been previously accustomed to, in the same way as was done for native soldiers in the Indian Army.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The industry to which the hon. member's question refers is, comparatively speaking, a very small one, employing little more than a thousand coolies. I have no information as to the death-rate prevailing among them, but I have seen a letter on the subject from a visitor to Assam, published in the Calcutta newspapers, in which it is stated that the death-rate and sick-rate are high; but no figures are given. The suggestion that evil effects are produced by forced change to rice diet seems improbable, inasmuch as most of these coolies are drawn from rice-consuming districts. As at present advised, I see no occasion for the issue of regulations on this subject, and I may add that the writer above-mentioned bears testimony to the excellence of existing arrangements for feeding and housing the coolies and for providing them with medical care.

AFGHANISTAN AND THE KAFIRS.

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Amír of Afghanistan had any right to control the action of the Government of India in offering an asylum to fugitive Kafirs in Chitral:

Whether the Amír was prepared to allow an unmolested exodus, not only to fugitive Kafirs from the Bashgal Valley which borders on Chitral, but also to emigrant Kafirs from other parts of Kafiristan into British territory generally:

And whether the surviving Kafirs from the present Afghan campaigns, or any future campaigns, would be protected in the enjoyment of their personal liberty, their lands and other property, and the exercise of their religious and social usages, as was implied in the right hon. gentleman's recent statements.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: So long as the Amír's Kafir subjects who seek an asylum in Chitral do not violate the usual conditions attached to their reception by the British Government which is in alliance with the Amír no such right can be claimed.

The other questions asked by the hon. member concern the Amír's internal policy and the exercise of his authority in his own territories, and I am unable to state or to anticipate what policy His Highness will pursue.

WARLIKE OPERATIONS (KILLED AND WOUNDED.)

East India (Warlike Operations) (Killed and Wounded).—Return (presented 11th February) to be printed. (No. 154.)

April 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

On the motion of Sir HENRY FOWLER an Address was granted for Copy of the Indian Financial Statement for 1896-7, and of the proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon.

THE LEE-METFORD BULLET.

Mr. BROOKFIELD asked the Under Secretary for War whether the "stopping" power of the Lee-Metford bullet, as shown in the Chitral expedition and by recent events in South Africa, had engaged the special attention of the military authorities, and whether it had been shown that the bullet in question was capable of any improvement with the special object of "stopping" as distinguished from merely inflicting mortal wounds, and could he state what was the minimum hole required to abruptly arrest the progress of a man charging; and whether he could state the respective calibres of the revolver used in the royal navy and the Lee-Metford rifle.

Mr. BRODRICK: The respective calibres of the revolver used in the navy and the Lee-Metford rifle are ·541 and ·303. The whole question of calibres has been carefully considered, with a view to efficiency in warfare, and any steps found necessary

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

will be taken. With regard to the minimum hole required to abruptly arrest the progress of a man charging, that would depend very much on the part of his person which is hit by the bullet. (Loud laughter.)

Sir W. LAWSON: Is it not the object of a rifle to inflict a mortal wound?

Mr. BRODRICK: That is the object of the bullet, but it cannot always be attained.

THE MOPLAH OUTBREAK IN MALABAR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had now received the further information with reference to the Moplah outbreak in Malabar:

And whether he would direct an independent inquiry to be held into the origin of the outbreak and the circumstances under which 88 Moplahs, who had taken refuge in a temple, were put to death.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: On the 16th of March the Government of Madras telegraphed as follows:—"A small detachment of our troops were fired upon first by Moplahs. Reinforcements arriving fired a volley which was returned. The Moplahs were then invited to surrender, but replied abusively, asking the troops to fire. One of the Moplahs cut the throats of the wounded to prevent their capture alive: others were shot dead by their own side. The collector reports that another day's delay in attack would have increased the gang to 300."

The telegram further promises a despatch which I expect to receive shortly, and pending its receipt, I see no reason to pass any orders on the subject. The Government of Madras have already deputed a former collector of the district, in whom the people have confidence, as a special commissioner to investigate the outbreak.

May 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was in a position to give any further information as to the fighting operations conducted by troops from Kabul in Kafiristan:

Whether the cession of the Bashgal Valley to Afghanistan, and the presence of Afghan troops there, contravene an essential condition of the Durand Treaty:

Whether Chandak was the extreme point allowed by that treaty for Afghan influence:

Whether the cession of the Bashgal Valley was the cession of a territory at least 30 miles to the north of Chandak, containing 40,000 inhabitants and 4,600 fighting men:

And whether he could state the terms of the agreement ratified by the Amír with reference to this valley.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have received no further information as to the conduct of military operations in Kafiristan.

The Bashgal Valley was assigned to the Amír under the revision on the spot prescribed by Clause 4 of the Kabul agreement of 12th November, 1893. Clause 3 of that Agreement originally contemplated that the extreme point would be Chandak or Chanak, as it is sometimes called.

The Bashgal Valley is a name roughly applied to the country from the Mandul Pass to the Kunar river, which may be 60 miles in length, with a possible population of 20,000.

The Agreement referred to has been laid on the Table and circulated.

Sir C. DILKE asked whether it was not the fact that two years elapsed between the date of the agreement and the revision, and whether the valley had not been occupied by the troops of the Amír between the dates of the two instruments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not think so, but I cannot speak confidently as to that. Eighteen months elapsed between the signing of the formal Agreement and the ratification of the revision, but the local delimitation was, I think, complete before the troops of the Amír occupied the valley.

May 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

DEMARCATION OF FRONTIERS.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the demarcation of the Perso-Beluchistan and Indo-Afghan frontier had now been completed:

And whether he proposed to lay upon the Table of the House any papers relating to this subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Perso-Biluch frontier is demarcated, but I have not yet received the final report or map. The whole of the Indo-Afghan frontier is not yet demarcated under the Kabul agreement; and although for special reasons I have laid on the Table the agreement arrived at with regard to the Bashgal Valley, I cannot give any undertaking with regard to the presentation of further papers until the work of demarcating is complete.

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF KAFIRS.

Mr. JOSEPH A. PEASE asked the Secretary of State for India whether advantage would be taken by the British Government, or the Government of India, of the favourable disposition of the Amír in discountenancing, as far as he could do so, the traffic in Kafir slaves, by urging upon him, as the ally of an anti-slavery nation, to restore the recently deported Kafirs to their homes, and to devise means for eventually terminating the institution of slavery itself throughout his dominions.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The hon. member is aware that the Viceroy intends to avail himself of any favourable opportunity to exercise his influence on behalf of the Kafirs; but it is improbable that the object contemplated by the hon. member would be promoted by any interference of the Government of India in the internal administration of Kafiristan in the direction indicated in the question.

INDIAN ARMY PENSION DEFICIENCY.

The Indian Pension Deficiency was considered in Committee.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER moved: "That it is expedient to authorise the charge on the Consolidated Fund of an annuity of £65,000 (beyond the present amount of £150,000 authorised by the Indian Army Pension Deficiency Act, 1885) towards discharging the liability of the Consolidated Fund in respect of certain Indian Army Pensions; and to provide that the rate of interest for any money lent after the 1st day of April, 1896, under section 5 of the said Act, shall be such as the National Debt Commissioners may determine."

Mr. D. LLOYD-GEORGE asked that some explanation should be given of the motion.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said he did explain the matter in introducing the Budget, but he would be happy to give the explanation again. Up to 1884 India discharged her liability for that part of our soldiers' pensions which was earned by service in India by the payment of a capital sum calculated on the probability of the lives of the pensioners. In 1884 it was discovered that, owing to delay in the calculations, to the omission to calculate the pensions which fell due before 1870, to the calculations being based on too high a rate of interest, and to the fund not having been properly invested, the fund was practically bankrupt, and there was nothing left to bear the charges of the pensions of soldiers which it was necessary should be borne. By an Act of 1885 Parliament set up an annuity of £150,000 for sixty years on which the Commissioners of the National Debt were authorised to borrow sufficient sums to pay the pensions as they become due, but it had been found lately that the calculations on which that annuity was based were themselves defective, and that in a very short time, if the funds were allowed to go on as now, it would become bankrupt, and there would be nothing left with which to pay future pensions. It was, therefore, necessary to provide a fresh annuity of £65,000, to close in 1941. What has happened was, of course, the fault of their predecessors, and they had no option in the matter. The provision of the money was an essential part of the financial year, and he proposed a clause on the Resolution which, according to recent practice, would be included in the Budget.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

On the motion of Mr. HANBURY an Address was presented for "Copy of Minute by the Secretary of State for India stating the circumstances under which certain members of his permanent establishment have been retained in the service after they have attained the age of sixty-five."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

East India (Financial Statement). Return presented relative thereto [Address 30th April; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table.

May 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE NEW POSTAL CONTRACT FOR INDIA.

Sir JOHN LENG asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether any acceleration of time in the conveyance of the mails was contemplated in the new postal contract for India and the far East; and, if so, what would be the minimum speed at sea of the steamers carrying the mails:

Whether his attention had been called to the slow movement and numerous stoppages of the mail trains between Brindisi and Modane:

Whether, in view of the fact that the mails could arrive as soon in England if landed at Marseilles, without the steamer calling at Brindisi, an option would be reserved to the Post Office to make Marseilles the port both for the embarkation and debarkation of the mails for the United Kingdom.

Mr. HANBURY: Although it cannot be known what tenders will be received for the new postal contract for India and the far East, it may be said that the advertisement for tenders contemplates acceleration when the present contracts expire on January 31st, 1898, seeing that no tender is invited for as low a speed as the *minimum* required by the present contract. The lowest speeds for which tenders have been asked are 13½ knots to and from Bombay, 13¼ knots to and from Adelaide *via* Colombo, and 11½ knots between Colombo and Shanghai; but tenders may be sent in for any speed, higher or lower. It is the fact that in Italy the special train service for these mails is performed at a lower rate and with a greater aggregate time for stops than in France. The hon. member is doubtless aware that a considerable part of the Italian railway is a single line. The European port to be used in the service of the future is not specified in the advertisement for tenders. It will be open to parties tendering to select Marseilles: and, if an offer based upon the embarkation and landing of mails at Marseilles, showed better results than an offer based on Brindisi or any other port, the Postmaster-General would be free to choose the service *via* Marseilles.

INDIAN ARMY PENSION DEFICIENCY.

The report of the Resolution of Committee on this subject was received and agreed to without discussion.

May 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DURAND AGREEMENT.

THE STORY OF THE BASHGAL VALLEY.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between the Viceroy of India and the Amír of Afghanistan which led to the cession of the Bashgal Valley to Afghanistan:

Whether the supplementary Agreement of 19th December, 1895, was drawn up in consequence of pressure by the Amír and in the midst of the Chitral campaign, and what had been the corresponding compensation made by the Amír for the cession:

Whether the boundary, settled in principle by the Durand Treaty, was similar to the demarcation made by Colonel Holditch, of the Indian Survey Department, and whether this boundary included the Bashgal Valley and the Nari villages:

Whether one of the Boundary Commissioners, who settled the later boundary of December, 1895, was the Afghan Commander-in-Chief, and whether this line of demarcation was made to include the Bashgal Valley after its invasion by the Afghan troops:

And whether the Mehtar of Chitral and the Mahárájá of Kashmir had given their written consent to the cession of the Bashgal Valley before it was made.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: 1. No correspondence took place between the Viceroy and the Amír with reference to the Bashgal Valley.

2. The decision to revise the frontier, as proposed to be laid down in the Durand Treaty, was arrived at in February, 1895, before the Chítral expedition was contemplated; and, as I have already stated, that decision was based on the ground that the topographical conditions were found to be not what they had been supposed to be. There was, therefore, no question of compensation on either side.

3. Colonel Holditch was the chief survey officer of the Commission which revised the Durand frontier in the manner (April 16th) already explained.

4. The Afghan Commander-in-Chief was one of the Afghan Commissioners, but his forces did not enter the Bashgal Valley until after the signature of the Agreement which gave that district to the Amír.

5. The Government of India conducted the negotiations on behalf of the Native States interested, and no written consent to this or to any other detail of the Agreement was necessary.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

East India (India Office, Retirement at 65). Return presented relative thereto [Address 4th May; Mr. Hanbury]; to lie upon the Table.

THE JHALAWAR CASE.

On the motion of Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS, a return was granted for Copy of Correspondence relating to the deposition of the Mahárájá Rana of Jhalawar.

May 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

East India (Indian Tariff Act and the Cotton Duties)—copy presented—of Papers relating to the Indian Tariff Act, 1896, and the Cotton Duties Act, 1896 (in continuation of [C. 7602]) (by command) to lie upon the Table.

May 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA OFFICE: RETIREMENT AT 65.

East India (India Office, Retirement at 65),—Return (presented 7th May) to be printed. (No. 171).

PROCLAMATION AND PERFORMANCE.

THE OCCUPATION OF THE MALAKAND PASS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that in the proclamation issued by Lord Elgin before the Chitral expedition, the Government of India pledged itself not to occupy permanently any territory of the Swat tribes, he would state if the strong post recently built in the Malakand Pass was situated within that territory:

And whether he would state for what period it was proposed to occupy that post.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The proclamation to which the hon. baronet refers was issued at the outbreak of hostilities, and states that the Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which their force may pass.

The proclamation has been adhered to. Negotiations for the maintenance and protection of a road to Chitral had been carried on for some time with the tribes before the outbreak of hostilities, and the Chitral expedition afforded a favourable opportunity for completing them. With the assent and approval of the tribes, arrangements were made for protecting the road which included among other things the stationing of a force at the Malakand Pass. It will be maintained there so long as it is necessary for the purpose for which it was established.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

"SPECIAL TERMS" FOR MILITARY OFFICERS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether colonels of the Indian Army drawing colonel's allowances of £1,140 per annum and more, paid £60 per annum for sons at Sandhurst and at Woolwich, while the sons of retired officers of Her Majesty's Indian Civil Service were charged £150 per annum; and, if so, if Her Majesty's Government would remedy this inequality by classing members of the Indian Civil Service with military officers according to relative rank, as they were already classed in regard to eligibility for Queen's Indian cadetships for their sons.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The facts are as stated in the question. Special terms are granted to the sons of military officers, not with reference to their means, but because their military services are held to entitle them to special facilities for sending their sons to the two military colleges. I do not think that Her Majesty's Government could be expected to extend this privilege to civilians.

QUESTIONS ON THE PROVINCIAL BUDGET.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the case that, up to the present time, the members of the Bengal Legislative Council had, under No. 7 of the rules sanctioned by the Governor-General in Council, enjoyed the right of asking questions regarding the Provincial Budget:

Whether, on the 4th of April last, the Lieutenant-Governor expressed an intention of taking away that right:

Whether the Secretary of State would state upon what grounds it was proposed to take away that right, and whether it could be taken away without an alteration of the rules sanctioned by the Governor-General in Council:

Whether he was aware that in 1894 eighteen questions were asked regarding the Provincial Budget, in 1895 sixteen questions, and in 1896 ten questions: and whether it was alleged that this right of interpellation had been in any way abused:

And whether the Secretary of State would make enquiry, and direct that this much valued right, enjoyed under Section 2 of the Indian Councils Act, 1896, should be continued.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that in the last three years a number of questions relating to the Budget have been asked, before the discussion of the Budget, in the Bengal Legislative Council. As to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor I know nothing officially, but from a newspaper report I gather that in his opinion the practice is irregular and inconvenient and tends to waste time, and that what he proposes is to assimilate in this respect the practice of his Council to that of the Supreme Council. I see no reason for any special inquiry.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: I desire to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether there is any truth in the rumour, now furnished in some detail in some of the prints of to-day, of the dispatch of Indian troops to Suakin; further, if the rumour be true, whether a motion will be submitted to this House in connection with the subject; and, further, by whom the expense will be borne. (Hear, hear.)

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Her Majesty's Government have decided to dispatch certain Indian troops to replace the Egyptian garrison at Suakin, which, with the exception of one battalion of infantry, will be moved across to the Valley of the Nile. As regards the apportionment of expense between the two Governments it is still under consideration, and I cannot at present say whether it will be necessary or not to lay a resolution on the Table of the House.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Which two Governments?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Government of India and Her Majesty's Government, and, of course, until that matter is decided, I cannot give a definite answer as to whether it will be necessary for me to move a resolution and place it on the Table of the House.

Mr. HENRY LABOUCHERE: Are we to understand that the expense of these troops is not to be borne by the Egyptian Government?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir, not at all. (Laughter.)

Mr. JOHN MORLEY: It means, then, that in regard to the expenditure the two Governments concerned are Her Majesty's Government and the Indian Government?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER was understood to assent to this.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I should like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, before any further progress is made with the Finance Bill, we shall have a statement from him as to whether or not any or what part of the charge for these troops that are brought to Suakin will be placed on the English Exchequer?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not absolutely see the necessity for such a statement, but I will consider the matter. The present position is this—that if it is decided, as I assume, having regard to previous precedents, it will be, that the ordinary expenditure of these troops shall be charged upon the Indian Government—(cries of "Oh!")—a resolution of course would, in accordance with the Act of Parliament, be brought forward on the subject. The question whether the further expense connected with the matter will be defrayed by the Egyptian Government or by a vote of this House will be a matter for consideration.

May 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET. PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate)—copy presented—of estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India for 1895-6, compared with the results of 1894-5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Finance and Revenue Accounts),—copy presented—of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India, 1894-5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Home Accounts)—copy presented—of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Secretary of State for India whether, according to precedent, a resolution to charge the revenues of India for the cost of moving Indian troops away from India was needed, even if it was intended that the whole charge should ultimately be borne otherwise than by India:

When it was intended that the necessary resolution to charge the revenues of India for the cost of sending to Suakin the regiments now detailed for duty in the Sudan should be submitted to the House:

And whether, if it was intended that any portion of the charge, ordinary or extraordinary, should ultimately fall upon the revenues of India, the consent of the Government of India had been asked.

Lord G. HAMILTON: According to precedent, no resolution is necessary for the employment of Indian troops outside India unless a charge be imposed upon Indian revenues for that purpose. In any decision arrived at as to the apportionment or incidence of expense the views of the Indian Government will be fully considered. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Is not the noble lord aware that on March 9th, 1885, a directly opposite opinion was given on behalf of the Government on the point covered by the first paragraph of the question? (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. HAMILTON: I think that, according to precedent, no resolution has been moved unless a charge was imposed on the Indian revenue. I do not know to whom the right hon. gentleman refers or who made the speech to which he alludes.

Sir C. DILKE: The Under-Secretary of State of the day.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I do not know who made the speech, but I am advised that what I have stated is accurate law. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Has not the noble lord looked at the precedent of March, 1885, in which the Under-Secretary asserted the contrary of what he has now stated?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not read the speech to which the right hon. gentleman refers, but I have followed precedent, and I have accurately described those precedents. (Hear, hear.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Sir C. DILKE: Unless this matter is raised upon an earlier date, which is quite possible, I shall call attention to it on the motion for the adjournment over the Whitsuntide recess. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the First Lord of the Treasury when it was proposed to give the House an opportunity of deciding upon the employment of Indian troops at Suakin, in conformity with the principle laid down in 1882 by the then Secretary of State for India, that, both legally and constitutionally, there was reserved to Parliament full control over all cases of the employment of Indian troops beyond the frontiers of India. The right hon. gentleman added that the Secretary of State at the time to which he referred was Lord Hartington, now the Duke of Devonshire.

Mr. BALFOUR: In point of actual law there is no obligation under the statute to have the assent of Parliament unless some extra charge is thrown upon the Indian finance. But precedent is undoubtedly in favor of giving Parliament an opportunity in these cases of discussing whether India should bear the extraordinary charges. Such an opportunity, on that assumption, would, of course, be given to the House. (Cheers.)

Mr. MORLEY: May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether he has read the passage to which this question refers? The speech was made by Lord Hartington on July 30th, 1882. In that speech the right hon. gentleman will find that his noble colleague laid down the principle which I have indicated. I also wish to ask whether the right hon. gentleman is aware that the noble duke did imply that the House was to have full control over the question whether Indian troops are to be employed at all outside India without the consent of Parliament.

Mr. BALFOUR: I do not feel called upon to give any authoritative interpretation of speeches made thirteen years ago. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

Mr. MORLEY: I shall put a question on the subject on Thursday.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the military force that was to be sent from India to Suakin was to be employed only as a garrison to defend Suakin and the district around it against attacks by the Sudanese, or whether it was intended that it should take part in the invasion of the Sudan by Egypt:

And whether any agreement had been entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Italian Government in respect to military action in the Sudan of which the House was not cognizant.

Mr. CURZON: The military force that is to be sent from India will be employed for the defence of Suakin and the surrounding district according to the judgment of the Sirdar. It is not intended that the Indian troops should take part in the operations in the valley of the Nile. No agreement has been entered into between Her Majesty's Government and the Italian Government in respect to military action in the Sudan. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. LOUGH asked how many troops were going to be brought from India to Suakin.

Mr. CURZON: I think that the numbers are about 60 British officers, 60 native officers, and from 2,000 to 2,500 men. (Hear, hear.)

Sir C. DILKE: Can the right hon. gentleman give us any information as to when the opportunity for discussion will be given to the House?

Mr. BALFOUR: I will endeavour to consult the convenience of the House, but I cannot name a day.

May 13*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET: PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Estimate). Paper (presented 12th May); to be printed. [No. 179.]

East India (Home Accounts). Paper (presented 12th May) to be printed. [No. 180.]

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Sir C. DILKE said that the First Lord of the Treasury was reported in all the daily papers except one to have said yesterday afternoon that precedent was undoubtedly in favour of giving Parliament, when a movement of Indian troops away from India was proposed, an opportunity of discussing whether India should bear the ordinary charges connected therewith. In one paper, however—an important one—the right hon. gentleman was represented as using the expresssion "extra-ordinary charges" instead of "ordinary charges." He wished to ask whether the word "extraordinary" that occurred in this report was an error.

Mr. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; I think that is so. The view of the Government—at least, my view—on the legal point is that there is no strict obligation to bring forward a Resolution in this House if India is only charged the ordinary expenses; but precedent is in favour of having a Resolution even in these circumstances, and it is not therefore proposed to break through that precedent, although the precedent is not absolutely universal.

May 14*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WANTED: A PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, as stated in a telegram from Rangoon published in the *Times* of 12th May, it was true that he had offered to sanction the creation of a Legislative Council for Burma; and, if so, whether he would favourably consider the grant of a Legislative Council to the Punjab, as prayed for during the last ten years.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that the question as to the establishment of Legislative Councils in Burma and in the Punjab is now under the consideration of the Government of India, and that I am expecting to receive a report from them on the subject: but I am, of course, unable in the meantime to give any opinion as to the decision which may be arrived at.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked if the Secretary of State was aware that in 1882 Sir James Lyall, as Lieutenant-Governor, approved the proposal to establish a Legislative Council in the Punjab.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON was understood to say that he was aware of Sir James Lyall's opinion, but that subsequent Lieutenant-Governors had expressed themselves in the opposite sense.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. SCHWANN asked the Secretary of State for India whether native East Indian soldiers were informed on their enlistment that they were liable to be sent out of India for service abroad:

And, would he state briefly the clauses in the East Indian Enlistment Act which dealt with the territory or territories in which Indian soldiers might be called upon to serve; and, if not, would he cause a copy of the East India Enlistment Act to be placed in the library, within reach of members; and, should there be no special East India Enlistment Act, then a copy of the old East India Company's regulations on this subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Under Article 1 of the Indian Articles of War a native soldier is enlisted to go "wherever he is ordered by land or sea." The liability to be sent on foreign service is carefully explained to all recruits.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India had given its consent to the revenues of India being charged with the expenses, either ordinary or extraordinary, of the troops to be sent to Suakin:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table, as was done in a similar case in 1882-3, the telegrams and correspondence with the Government of India on the subject.

He also asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of his statement of 2nd March, he could now tell the House whether India was to bear any part of the charge for the expenses of the Indian force recently sent to Mombasa.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: We are in correspondence with the Government of India, and I will follow the precedent of 1882-83 in laying the correspondence and telegrams on the Table of the House.

As regards the second question, it would be convenient if

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the hon. gentleman will allow me to defer this question till to-morrow when I hope to make a statement both with regard to Suakin and Mombasa.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Who is actually paying for the ships which are chartered for the removal of the troops from Bombay?

Lord G. HAMILTON: There is an account periodically adjusted between the Indian and Imperial Governments, by which advances are made for convenience, and it is the practice to advance sums from the Indian Treasury in connexion with the transport of troops from India. These advances are not held to be charges.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Secretary of State for India what was the estimated cost per month for ordinary expenses of the Indian military force that was being despatched to Suakin.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The approximate monthly cost in India of the native troops under orders for Suakin is Rs. 90,000 or £5,000.

Mr. MORLEY: Does this include superannuation charges?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No; I think not. It is their ordinary pay and allowances.

Mr. MORLEY: I assume, after what fell from the noble lord just now, that to-morrow is the day to be devoted to the discussion of this subject?

Mr. BALFOUR: All that my noble friend said was that to-morrow he would make a statement, both with regard to the Indian troops to be sent to Suakin and those sent to Mombasa. I propose to give the first Parliamentary day after the conclusion of the Committee stage of the Bill now under discussion to the debate of the question. (Opposition cries of "Oh, oh," and Ministerial cheers.)

May 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA COUNCIL'S DRAFTS.

Mr. ORR-EWING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any intention of appointing a departmental committee, as suggested by the late Secretary of State for India in September, 1895, to enquire into the present method of selling Council drafts.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no present intention of appointing a Committee but the subject shall have my careful attention.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR MOMBASA AND THE SUDAN.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of his statement of 2nd March, he could now tell the House whether India was to bear any part of the charge for the expenses of the Indian force recently sent to Mombasa.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: As regards the cost of the employment of Indian troops at Mombasa, Her Majesty's Government do not propose that any charge shall, in connexion with their services there, be made on the revenues of India, and therefore, according both to law and precedent no Resolution is necessary to authorise their employment beyond the external frontiers of India.

Her Majesty's Government propose that the ordinary pay and allowances of the Indian native troops under orders for Suakin should continue to be borne by the revenues of India, and I will therefore give notice of my intention to move a Resolution, in accordance with precedent, to give effect to that decision.

Mr. BUCHANAN: When will the motion be put upon the paper.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Very shortly.

Sir C. DILKE: Are we to understand that the ordinary pay is to be borne otherwise than by India?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No; there is no charge upon the revenues of India in connexion with the employment of that force outside India.

Sir C. DILKE: I understood that; but does that mean that the ordinary pay of the troops is to fall upon India?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes.

May 18th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN MEDAL.

Captain CHALONER asked the Secretary of State for India whether, inasmuch as the India Medal was given for the 1863 Waziri Expedition, and also for the 1895 expedition against the same tribe, when the only fight (viz.: at Wano) was previous to the expedition being sent, and out of which it arose, he would consider the question with a view to granting the India Medal to those who took part in the 1881 expedition, in which there was a fight.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I can only refer my hon. friend to the reply given by my predecessor to a somewhat similar question on the 23rd July, 1894—nor could I reopen the question by reconsidering the request to grant a medal for an expedition which took place fifteen years ago.

THE CHITRAL PROCLAMATION.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether, inasmuch as the Proclamation of the Government to the tribes on the occasion of the Chitral campaign, entered upon on the 1st April, 1895, declared that its object was the protection, in the interest of Chitral, of the Nari villages, he would state whether the Nari villages handed over to Afghanistan under paragraph 8 of the Supplementary Agreement of 9th April, 1895, were the same Nari villages as those referred to in the Proclamation.

Whether those villages were the ancestral possession of Chitral; and, if so, would he state on what grounds Chitral had been deprived of them in direct contravention of the Proclamation:

And, whether the consent of the Suzerain of Chitral, the Maháráját of Kashmir, had been obtained to the cession.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The proclamation referred to the objects of the Chitral expedition and to those alone.

The agreement of 9th April, 1895, completed certain delimitation proceedings between the Government of India and the Amír of Afghanistan which commenced long before any expedition to Chitral was contemplated.

The Nari villages included in Afghanistan by the Agreement of April, 1895, were no doubt villages to which the Mehtar of Chitral laid claim. This claim was not proved, and the Mehtar's right to villages not then in his possession and to which neither Chitral nor its suzerain had made out a title was not confirmed.

INDIAN EXHIBITION AT LISBON.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information regarding the projected exhibition to be held at Lisbon next year to celebrate the fourth centenary of Vasco de Gama's discovery of the route to India:

And, whether the Portuguese Government had invited England to take an important part in that exhibition; if so, whether it was intended to comply with such request.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Beyond what I have seen in the newspapers I have no information regarding the projected exhibition.

No invitation for India to take part in the exhibition has reached me.

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in accordance with section 21 of the Indian Councils Act (24 and 25 Vic., c. 67,) the Governor General of India had transmitted to him authentic copies of the Cotton Duties Act, 1896, and the Act to amend the Indian Tariff Act of 1894, and whether, under that section, he would disallow those Acts on the ground that they increase the burden of taxation on the poorest class in India, while lightening the taxation on those who were comparatively well to do:

If not, whether, by Executive order, he would remit both import and excise duties upon the coarser cloths used by the poorer classes of consumers:

And, would he state whether members of the Council of the Secretary of State had recorded minutes with regard to the rearrangement of the cotton duties; and, if so, would he place such minutes upon the Table of the House.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received copies of the Acts named in the question; and have informed the Government of India that those Acts will be left to their operation.

It is probable that the poorer classes of the population of India are the principal consumers of the cloths made in Indian mills from counts of 20 and under, which are now taxed for the first time; but, for this among other reasons, the duty has been reduced to 3½ per cent. *ad valorem*, and, considering the enormous number of consumers, this additional taxation, the total amount of which has been roughly estimated at eighteen lakhs, represents an infinitesimally small increase of cost to the individual purchaser; while, on the other hand the duty on yarns has been abolished, so that the whole products of handlooms are untaxed.

It has been found by experience on more than one occasion that it is not advisable to fix a standard of quality, below which goods are exempt from taxation, and, in these circumstances, I do not propose to advise the Government of India to remit the duties recently imposed by the Legislature.

Minutes regarding these two Acts were recorded by two members of Council and by myself. There will be no objection to laying these Minutes on the Table, if the hon. baronet will move for them.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: In consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the answer of the noble lord, I beg to give notice that at the earliest possible opportunity I will call attention to this arrangement as to the cotton duties, which relieves the rich at the expense of the poor.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. MORLEY asked the noble lord the Secretary of State for India if he was now in a position to state to the House the terms of the resolution as to the Indian contingents to be sent to Suakin.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said he had not the terms of the motion with him, but he thought he could lay the motion on the Table that night.

THE COTTON DUTIES AND THE INDIAN POOR.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN AND THE INDIA OFFICE.

SIR H. FOWLER AGAIN.

Immediately at the close of questions,

Sir W. WEDDERBURN asked leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a matter of definite and urgent public importance—viz., "The effect of the Indian cotton duties as recently re-arranged, which are causing grave dissatisfaction in India by increasing the burden of taxation imposed upon the poorest classes of the consumers."

The SPEAKER asked whether the hon. gentleman was supported by forty members, as required by the rules, whereupon nearly all the members of the Opposition, save those on the front bench, rose in their places.

Leave was therefore given, but

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON inquired whether the hon. member was entitled to move the adjournment, inasmuch as he had only a few minutes ago given verbal notice of his intention to bring the question forward on an early day.

The SPEAKER said that in absolute strictness the hon. member might seem to have disentitled himself to move the adjournment by giving his notice, but if the hon. member told him that in so doing he only referred to the motion he now proposed to make he would not prevent the hon. gentleman from proceeding.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN signified his assent, and then said that very grave dissatisfaction existed in India because a new and uncalled for tax had been placed upon the necessaries of the poorest classes of the Indian consumers. The House was aware that the poorer classes in India already bore more than their fair share of taxation. (Hear, hear.) The great problem was to make the well-to-do bear a little larger share of taxation, and almost the only way to do that was to tax the finer classes of cloth, which were only worn by the richer people. The import duties upon the finer cloth was approved of by public opinion n India, but it appeared to be a very inopportune time to put a new tax of 10 lakhs of rupees upon the poorer classes when the taxes which fell upon the richer classes were being reduced by 50 lakhs. The sting of the thing to the people of India was that the new tax was quite unnecessary, and, in their opinion, was only imposed in order to give satisfaction to the Lancashire people. The people in India had been advised not to use Lancashire-made goods at all. Surely, from a political point of view, such a state of feeling as the giving of such advice exhibited ought not to be allowed to exist another day. There was no need of fresh legislation, because the noble lord could, in his Executive capacity, by a stroke of the pen remove the grievance which was being felt throughout India. This motion was in no sense a party one. He made no attack upon the Government, and far less did he wish to make an attack upon the noble lord, who he was convinced had given great attention to the subject and decided it in the way that appeared to him to be the best all round. But the noble lord laboured under the great disadvantage that he had never been in India, and therefore could not appreciate the strength of the feeling which existed in that country on this question. All classes were united upon this matter, rich and poor, official and unofficial, Indian and Anglo-Indian. The noble lord should not take comfort from thinking that the agitation had ceased. He would refer to the letter given from a leading Mahárájá, which Lord Roberts read with approval in another place. That letter said that when the people of India protested openly against any measure it was a compliment to the British nation, because it showed they hoped to get justice. The Mahárájá added: "If we had no faith in England and Englishmen all agitation would have ceased, and there would have been a death-like calmness, not perhaps a very desirable thing in the political world of India." The fact was that, if open agitation in this matter ceased in India, it was not because the people had become indifferent, but rather because the grievance complained of had sunk deeply in their minds because they had become hopeless of receiving justice. It was not unfrequently the case that when outer symptoms of discontent were suppressed real danger began. He therefore begged the noble lord to look into the real merits of the case and not to be deceived by mere outward appearances. The whole point of this controversy had reference to the question of protection. When in 1895 Sir Henry James moved the adjournment of the House on the question of the cotton duties, the ground on which he did so was that Lancashire complained that the duties were protective in their nature—that on the finer counts the protection was partial, but that on the coarser counts, owing to the tariff of 1894, it was absolute. Under that tariff all cotton goods imported were made liable to an *ad valorem* duty of 5 per cent., and by way of countervailing duty the excise was placed on yarns above 20's. The argument of Lancashire was that this gave partial protection to the Indian mills as regarded the finer counts, because Lancashire paid upon the manufactured article, whereas the Indian millowners only paid upon the raw material—namely, the yarns. Lancashire further argued that absolute protection was given with regard to the coarser goods of 20's and under, because there was no excise on the yarns of those counts. The right hon. member for Wolverhampton, who was Secretary for India at that time, did not admit the plea of protection, but he said that he was willing to make further enquiries, and that, if it was shown that protection existed, he should be prepared to take measures to remove the injustice. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer concurred in that view, and therefore the only question really at issue was the point of protection, and this was confirmed by the present Secretary for India, who at the time of the last Indian Budget promised to eliminate from the duties everything savouring of the nature of protection. With the object of dealing with the question, two Bills had been brought in by the Government of India, but he complained that this legislation went far beyond the necessities of the case. It dealt with the alleged evil of protection in regard to the complaint of Lancashire, but it went far beyond that and did an injustice to the people of India. It removed the excise duty from yarns and placed it upon woven goods—upon the manufactured article. The effect of this was to remove the grievance of Lancashire with regard to the finer counts, while it imposed injustice on the Bombay millowners, because they had to pay twice over on the stores used in their mills. But the Government of India, without any necessity, went further than this

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

by reducing the duty on the finer counts from 5 per cent. to 3½ per cent., and thereby needlessly sacrificed a large amount of revenue. As to the coarser counts, also, there was the object of removing all protective influence. That might be done by placing the Lancashire producer and the Bombay producer on the same level in either of two ways —by having neither import nor excise duties, or by having both import and excise duties on the coarser counts. The universal opinion in India had been in favour of having neither import nor excise duties on the coarser counts, so that no tax should be placed on such articles used by the poorer classes. But, without any sufficient reason, that wish was put aside, and an excise duty had been placed on the industries of India. This step had caused great indignation in India, and it was for this reason that he had brought the matter forward. The Government having gone, as he had said, beyond the necessities of the case, the responsibility rested upon them of showing to the House that they were justified in the course they had adopted. It had been stated that Custom-house arrangements made it impossible to carry out the wishes of the people of India in the matter; but that could hardly be the fact, for the Government of Bombay had declared that there was no insuperable difficulty in remitting the duties on the coarser counts, and in 1878 greater difficulties of a similar character were successfully overcome. In 1878 the line tried to be drawn was at 30's, near the bulk of Manchester goods, so that the matter then was much more difficult to deal with, but it was grappled with successfully. Now the line proposed was 20's, and there is much less practical difficulty. Then there was another important point. The sole declared object of the rearrangement of the duties was to get rid of protection. But the result was to create protection on a larger scale in favour of handlooms, and mills in Native States. These together consumed three-fifths of all the yarn used in India. He was a friend to handloom weavers and to Native States, but from an economic point of view he must say they should not be given an unfair advantage. His main objection, however, was that the rearrangement relieved the richer and taxed the poorer. In the matter of food the poorer classes of India were very heavily taxed. There was no heavier tax known to the world than the salt tax, for the working man in India had to pay 40d. by way of duty for every one penny of value. Therefore he had to pay very heavily for his necessaries as regarded food, and it was not now the time to put a further tax upon his necessaries, that is, upon the wretched clothes he wore. It might be said that the amount was small, but then his means were small. The average income was 1½d. a day, and there was not much room for taxation out of that. Therefore he came back to his main contention, that, whereas the Government had taken off 50 lakhs from the taxation of the finer cloths worn by the richer, they had done very wrong in putting 10 lakhs on the coarser cloths worn by the poorer, and he appealed to the noble lord by a stroke of the pen to remove that grievance, which would have a very beneficial effect throughout India. He believed the Secretary for India somewhat questioned the statement that the coarser cloths were worn exclusively by the poorer classes. He thought it stood to reason that the coarser and cheaper fabrics would be worn by the poorer classes, and that seemed to be the view taken by all the authorities. That was the opinion of the India Office when the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton was Secretary for India, and he did not know what further information had led the noble lord to an alteration of that opinion. It was the basis of the whole complaint that the coarser cloths were worn by the poorer people. The Bombay Government, which he regarded as the highest authority in this matter, referred to the duty as a burden of taxation to be borne by the poorer classes, and that view was supported by the native gentlemen in the Viceroy's Council. He thought it was a little fantastic to say that the poor people wore the more expensive and finer cloths. His contention was that this tax upon the poor was uncalled for and that it was very injurious, both to the people it affected and in the feeling it had produced throughout India. He had no wish that this should be a party motion at all, and he appealed for support to those hon. members on the other side who were acquainted with Indian matters. He regretted that his old friend Sir George Chesney was no longer in his place to raise his voice against this tax, as he did on a former occasion, but there were other Anglo-Indian members still sitting in the House. There was his hon. friend the member for Bethnal Green, who was a direct representative of India, and the hon. member for Cardiff, and, if he had been present he would have made his appeal to the hon. baronet the member for Manchester, who was for a long time Governor of Bombay, and also his hon. friend the member for Central Hackney, who had had a long experience in India. He felt confident that those hon. members would be prepared to confirm what he said as to the strength of the feeling on this matter throughout India. Every representative association had put in its protest against what had been done. The Chambers of Commerce were at one with the Association of Millowners. It was a very remarkable thing that the Chamber of Commerce of Bombay should have taken this view so strongly, because it consisted entirely of gentlemen engaged in the import trade of cotton goods, and they pointed out that only two members of the body had any interest whatever in the Bombay mills. Public meetings had been held in different parts of India, and in every case the strongest possible protest had been sent in. He did not know what was the real feeling of the Government of India in this matter. They seemed to have changed a good deal from their original position, and he would like to ask the noble lord if he would explain how that conversion came about. He had read the Blue-book with very great care, and there was a curious hiatus between the important dispatch sent by the noble lord on the 5th of September last and the telegram from the Government of India of the 16th of January, from which it appeared that the Government of India had found salvation from the Secretary of State's point of view. He should like to know if they could be favoured with the correspondence which took place between those dates. He thought he might also safely appeal to the Lancashire members. He wished to make no attack whatever upon them for pressing their case as strongly as they could, but he would appeal to them to be satisfied with what they had got in this matter. They had received a very great concession in the remission of 1½ per cent. upon the import trade, and he would appeal to them not to oppose the proposal to remit the excise and import duties on the coarser counts. They now paid the same import as excise, and they had this advantage with regard to the double payment of taxation of stores. He really did not see why they should in any way oppose the removal on the import duties on the coarser fabrics. They had, too, at present a monopoly in drills, which were not made in India at all. Therefore this concession would actually be a benefit to them so far as drills were concerned. They had also pointed out that they were anxious to manufacture more of the coarser materials. If they were successful in doing so, it would also benefit them if the duty was taken off. If the Lancashire members were agitating so strongly for the removal of these duties altogether, surely it was illogical for them to object to a portion of the duties being removed. He also wished to appeal to the sentiment that was so forcibly put by the First Lord of the Admiralty when he pointed out how very unfortunate it would be if India and Lancashire should come into collision upon this matter. He did not wish to dilate upon the question of boycotting or of any hostile measures that might be taken in India, but it was a matter, he thought, that Lancashire should consider carefully. When they remembered that Japan, China, and America were running this country very hard in the matter of finer fabrics, it would be very unfortunate if their customers in India were to take their custom to those countries instead of to the Lancashire mills. He did not think this would be any sacrifice at all; but even if it were, it would be worth making in order to remove the feeling of indignation and to draw more closely the bonds between the people of this country and of India. He would appeal to the whole House, and remind them of what the late Viceroy said upon this subject of the financial treatment of India. Speaking in another place, he said: "There was never a moment when it is more necessary to counteract the growing impression that our financial policy in India is dictated by selfish considerations." This was a matter in which the people of India were exceedingly interested, and they would watch eagerly what the decision of that House would be. He trusted that decision would be in accordance with right and justice and humanity. (Hear, hear.)

Sir JOHN LENG, in seconding the Motion, said he could not claim to have spent the greater part of his life in India like his hon. friend the member for Banffshire, but he was very much struck with the words used by the late Secretary of State (Sir H. Fowler) on a memorable occasion when

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

his right hon. friend said that every member in this House was a member for India, and remembering those words he took occasion to spend the greater part of last winter on a visit to that great dependency. No one could do so without being deeply impressed with sympathy for the teeming millions of the peaceful, patient, industrial classes of India, and with a desire to do whatever was possible in a Parliamentary capacity to promote their welfare. He must admit that in moving through India he was not a little struck with the strong Conservative—he might say Imperialist—sentiments of our countrymen in India among the mercantile and manufacturing classes, and even the official classes. But he found that their Conservative and Imperialistic views had been not a little shaken by the attitude taken by a number of leading politicians in this country when in Opposition, and subsequently when they acceded to power, with regard to this question of the cotton duties. Wherever he went he heard nothing but admiration expressed for the firm attitude taken by the late Secretary for India, and on the other hand he heard nothing but resentment and strong disapprobation with regard to the course taken by a number of other politicians in—what was considered in India—the placing of local and provincial before Imperial considerations. Three things, he thought, must have struck everyone who had had time to look through the Blue-book which they received on Saturday morning. Those who had read the speeches of the able Finance Minister, Sir James Westland, in introducing this measure before the Council, must have felt that with him it was forced work, at all events, that he had very scanty respect for either the statements or the method of procedure adopted by those who took a leading part in the recent Lancashire agitation. Another impression which would be produced was that not only the non-official but that some of the most distinguished official members of the Indian Council were strongly opposed to the unsettlement of what they considered had been wisely settled in the time of the late Secretary of State. In the third place, they would find that it excited not only the opposition but the strong denunciation of the mercantile classes, and the public generally throughout our great Indian Dependency. There would be found in those papers telegram after telegram, message after message, resolution after resolution, representation after representation, from leading Chambers of Commerce in India supporting the views put forward by the Chamber of Commerce in Bombay, and it should be distinctly remembered that the members of those Chambers of Commerce, more particularly in Calcutta, were not identified with, nor interested in, the Indian cotton manufacturers in Bombay or other districts of India. They based their objections on solid and incontrovertible principles, and put forward statements of fact which, he thought, to every unprejudiced mind must be irresistible. In passing, he might observe that no stronger or more powerful statement was probably ever written on an Indian subject than that put forward by the Bombay Chamber of Commerce on these duties. During his visit to India he had many opportunities of meeting with commercial gentlemen, and he found that they were very strongly impressed with the view that those changes were not dictated by considerations for the interests of the people of India, but from political considerations in the home country. He would be glad if hon. members would turn to the very able speech of the Hon. Patrick Playfair. That gentleman was not a cotton manufacturer or cotton merchant, but was a most enlightened merchant in Calcutta, and on this and on other questions put forward most statesmanlike views. His contention was that if there was a surplus to be disposed of it would be better in the interests of the Manchester and Lancashire manufacturers that that surplus should be devoted to the construction of railways and the opening up of India for the distribution of the Manchester and Lancashire goods, rather than to be frittered away in the manner in which the Home Government had selected. Not only did the Hon. Mr. Playfair speak strongly on the matter, but three of the representatives of the native free provinces—the Hon. Sahib Balwant Rao, representing the Central Provinces; the Hon. Ananda Charlu, representing the Madras Presidency; and the Hon. Mr. Stevens, all spoke equally strongly. He would not weary the House by many quotations, but he might be permitted for a minute or two to select a passage from one of these speeches, namely, the Hon. Ananda Charlu. That gentleman said: "I am deeply grieved to find—I say this far more in sorrow than in anger—that our Finance Minister and the Government of which he is the adviser have allowed themselves to be overpowered by the unreasoning outcry of Lancashire, and to be tempted and drawn out of their safe and incontrovertible stronghold. I beseech the responsible ministers who have the power, if they possess the will, to see that our interests are not ruthlessly jeopardised. To my Anglo-Indian colleagues—my non-official colleagues in particular—I have a word of earnest prayer. I know that most of their class believe in a Conservative ministry, and that they are demonstrably partial to it. I know also that many Conservative members who constitute the bulwark of that ministry have entered Parliament pledged to look after the interests of Lancashire in India. I mean no offence when I therefore say, what I cannot help feeling, that my Anglo-Indian colleagues would be in the last degree reluctant to impair the bulwark. But I shall beg of them to bear in mind that while India is safeguarded against foreign inroads by the strong arm of the British power, she is defenceless in matters where the English and the Indian interests clash, and where (as a Tamil saying puts it) the very fence begins to feed on the crop. In all vital matters relating to India, England holds the whip-hand and men, sent out to us to watch those interests on the spot, are placed directly under that whip-hand. It requires preternatural strength of conviction and fortitude to withstand the flourish of the lash wielded by that whip-hand when the English and Indian interests stand mutually opposed. I am painfully conscious that I have spoken with considerable warmth, but I could not carry a smile on my lips or play the role of a soft-tongued courtier when I am face to face with a gross injury, which is in store for the masses." Not only do these representatives of the Native provinces speak, but the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir Alexander M'Kenzie, also strongly protested. Sir A. M'Kenzie said that: "Sir James Westland has not dealt with what to my mind is one of the principal objections to the measure, that is the protection and favouritism shown to one special item of our import tariff while there are undoubtedly many other items in that tariff which have equal claims to consideration. As a Free Trader myself, I shall rejoice to see the day when we revert to Free Trade altogether, but as long as our finances require us to realise duties of this kind I can see no particular reason why cotton should be more favoured than woollen or other goods in the tariff." These were the remarks of an able and trusted servant of the Crown, and he referred to them particularly because during his visits to India he had seen that other industries there, in consequence of the cheapness of labour and their having the raw material at their doors, were seriously affecting some of our home industries. There was the paper-making industry. The time was when almost every pound of paper used in India was exported from this country. Now there are several large and flourishing paper mills in India which had obtained almost the whole of the Government contracts, and were supplying the commercial classes with the whole of their paper. The consequences of this was that there had been a very large and serious reduction in the exports of paper from this country to India, and that was one of the causes why the paper industry in this country was now seriously depressed. Then there was another industry with which he was personally acquainted. It was that in which his own constituents were directly engaged. It had been for a number of years a very large and prosperous industry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member must confine himself to the question of the Cotton Duties.

Sir JOHN LENG bowed at once to the ruling of the Speaker. He went on to say that it might not be out of order for him to allude to a question which he put some time ago to the Secretary for India, and in which he referred to one serious inequality in the competition between English and Indian industries. It was an industry where they were allowed in India by the Factory Act to work Saturday and Sunday, night and day, all the year round. He appealed to the Secretary for India to use his influence in order that something like the Saturday and Sunday bank holidays which we had in this country might be established in that Indian industry; but the noble Lord relied simply on the legality of the Act, and gave no promise that he would interfere in the matter. The only other brief extract he would take from the Blue-book was a telegram which summed up very much the whole of the case. It was a telegram from the Hon. P. M. Mehta, President of the Bombay Presidency Association, to the Secretary of the Government of India, and was as follows: "I am instructed by the Council of the Bombay Presidency Association to telegraph to you the

CC-0. Chandrakasan Gangotri Collection. Digitized By eGangotri

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

following resolution passed to-day: 'That the pending proposal with regard to Cotton Duties before the Council is calculated to cause serious discontent among people, inasmuch as, coming on top of various recent measures, it leads people to firm conviction that their interests are being constantly sacrificed to those of a section of the British community; that it is a measure of grave political and economic impolicy to put an excise on coarse cloths worn by the poorest classes, especially when it is done after remitting a portion of duty paid by the richer classes on finer cloths, and that avowedly for no existing substantial reason, but, as admitted by the Finance Minister, solely for the purpose of enabling Lancashire to make experiment; that intense and real excitement and indignation prevail among all classes of people at proposed legislation; and the Council venture to urge that such policy cannot fail to be extremely detrimental to the best interests of the Empire.'" Large public meetings, with thousands attending them, had been held in all the great centres of population in India to protest against this alteration of the Cotton Duties. He felt interested in this question, because he was satisfied that the Lancashire agitation was based on a delusion, and was promoted by the cry that a great reduction of exports to India took place in the earlier months of 1895. Five months were a very limited period in the course of trade, and prominence was not given to the fact that in the year 1894 great speculation, great overtrading, and an excessive export of those cotton goods took place. The excess of exports to India in 1894 over the average of preceding years was not less than 357,000,000 yards, and in the first nine months of 1895 the reduction only amounted to 134,000,000, leaving an excess of 233,000,000 yards. He would like to bring another very striking fact before the House with regard to alleged Indian competition. Besides what the Bombay manufacturers sold for their own home market in India, they exported in 1893-4 about 54,000,000 yards of piece goods. That seemed a pretty large quantity, but there was imported from this country in the same period no less than 2,366,000,000 yards, chiefly from Lancashire. So that the Indian exports, which it was contended were to damage and ruin the Lancashire trade, amounted to only one-fortieth of what they imported from Lancashire. He would detain the House no further than to read a communication which he had received that morning from a gentleman who had spent more than a quarter of a century in India, and who was very intimately acquainted with both its financial and commercial interests. That gentleman wrote: "It is very unfortunate that the British Parliament has ever felt called upon to dictate to the Government of India the way in which its revenue shall or shall not be raised. The people of India who pay the taxes have the first claim to decide how the taxes shall be levied, and what those taxes shall be. The British Parliament has been until very recently regarded by the people of India as their last resort in search of equity and justice. It has been looked up to as the palladium of their rights. Magistrates might go wrong—men are but human—those charged with the government of the country might be led astray—such things do occur, and it was felt that the pulse of the British Parliament beat strong to help the oppressed, to do justice in scorn of consequence, and that self-interest and greed for gain might be searched for vainly within its walls." It must be borne in mind that, notwithstanding its many millions, the average income of the people of India is extremely small. Therefore, if a tax is to touch those millions, it must be on articles of daily use by them. There is an extremely heavy tax on salt, and a duty of 3½ per cent. on all cotton piece goods, whether imported into or manufactured in India by power-looms. Government by mandate, which is the name now given to the interference of the Secretary of State, is not calculated to cement the dependencies to the mother country, and it has certainly not tended to increase the loyalty of Her Majesty's Indian subjects, than whom it would be difficult to find a more peaceable, law-abiding, and orderly people.

Mr. PHILIP STANHOPE: Will the hon. member give the name of his correspondent?

Sir JOHN LENG shook his head.

LORD G. HAMILTON said he did not question the right of the hon. baronet to make use of the forms of the House to call attention to this matter, but thought it was unfortunate he had done so. It was, in his opinion, one of the most difficult and, perhaps, one of the most dangerous questions that Parliament could be called upon to deal with. The hon. baronet had alluded to the political danger of a collision between the public opinion of this country and of India. So far as he knew, Lancashire had never objected to the Indian Government having complete control over its taxation. What Lancashire contended for was the principle of perfect equality of treatment, and that, if India was to remain a part of the Empire, perfect equality of treatment was what Englishmen had a right to demand. So long as taxation was imposed on that principle, the political danger would disappear; but the moment it was attempted to differentiate between the industry of one country and the other, both were brought into collision. So long as the principle of perfect equality was established there was no fear of any wide difference of opinion between those who live in these islands and those who live in India. His predecessor in office, in giving his assent to the tariff of taxes of 1894, deemed that he had established that perfect equality of treatment, and declared, in most unmistakable terms, that, if it could be shown that these duties were in any way unequal in their application or protective in their character, he was bound to consider any such representation with the view and desire of eliminating from the duties any vestige of protection. (Hear, hear.) That was the attitude the right hon. gentleman took up and he was bound to say that he had endeavoured honourably to fulfil his pledges. (Hear, hear.) The previous duty which was in force was a 5 per cent. customs duty upon all cloth goods and yarns imported into India, but the duty, supposed to be equivalent to the customs duties raised by the Excise, was 5 per cent., not on the finished value of the cloth, but on the initial value of the yarn before it was woven into cloth, and all yarn below 20 counts was exempted from taxation; consequently it was demonstrably clear that all English goods which went to India under 20 counts paid a 5 per cent. duty from which similar goods made in India were exempt. He did not say that the difference was very substantial, but theoretically there was a case of protection. Anyone who looked at the able statement drawn up on behalf of Lancashire would see that the case was unanswerable—namely, that the duties as imposed did not comply with the sole condition which accompanied their imposition. In these circumstances the attention of the Indian Government was called to the fact, and they were asked to reconsider the tariff with a view to bring it into harmony with the Parliamentary condition on which alone it was sanctioned. The hon. gentleman had referred to the hiatus which occurred between his letter of the 5th of September and the telegram of the Indian Government of the 16th of January, and wanted to know what was done in the interval. The Government of India were acting, as far as they could, on the instructions contained in his letter, and were endeavouring to ascertain how they could possibly amend the tariff so as to bring it into conformity with the distinct pledge given to Parliament; and they were forced, after exhausting every conceivable method, to come to the conclusion that the only possible way to maintain these cotton duties in accordance with that pledge was to adopt the system which the hon. baronet now condemned. The hon. member said that he did not ask for very much. The hon. gentleman only asked that a line should be drawn across cotton goods, and that the Government should say that, inasmuch as there was but little competition between England and India in the lower counts, all those counts should be free, and that taxation should be imposed on cloth above a certain standard. The first reason why they should not adopt that course was that it was not in the interests of the poor consumer that they should do so, and the second was that this tariff which they had sent out was, in his judgment, calculated to impose a greater burden upon the poor consumer than the tariff which it succeeded. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that all economical and industrial forces were stationary, and that if they drew a hard-and-fast line and put a tax upon one side, that tax would leave things much as they were before. But all these forces were moving, and if they introduced merely a comparatively slight change they would cause a disturbance out of all proportion to the change. If they drew a hard-and-fast line, as had been proved over and over again, over a great mass of commodities, and said that all above a certain quality should be taxed, that would cause a rise in the price of all commodities to which that taxation applied. But they could not exempt those on the other side of the line from rising in price also. (Hear, hear.) They rose in sympathy. The primary object of these duties was that the Government should obtain as much as possible of the enhanced price, but the whole of the enhanced price of the yarn and cloths below 20's,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

which would be paid by the consumer under the proposal of the hon. baronet, would go into the pockets of the producers. (Hear, hear.) The hon. baronet was unconsciously advocating, not the interests of the poor consumer, but of the Bombay producer. Economically his proposal was altogether unsound. As long as there was a duty on yarns, it was possible to distinguish between the qualities of the yarns. Many of his hon. friends had been connected all their lives with the cotton trade, but he did not believe that one of them would say that when yarns were woven into cloth they could as accurately discriminate between what was above and what was below a certain line. The moment they attempted to draw such a line they would land themselves in endless difficulties. If they put a tax upon any particular article, it was essential that they should put a tax upon any substitute for it. The experiment was tried in India in 1878, and it had absolutely broken down. An exemption was made on certain classes of cotton goods, and the result was so extraordinary that he almost hesitated to quote the figures. He, however, had tested their accuracy. Before the slight alteration was made the free goods imported from England amounted to 9,000,000 yards, the amount of duty-paid goods being 358 million yards. In the first six months of the next year the duty-paid goods fell to 323 million yards, and the duty-free goods rose to 99 million yards; while in the subsequent year the duty-paid goods fell to 164 million yards, and the duty-free goods rose to 360 million yards. Sir James Westland, in his statement contained in the Blue-book, said that he had received a letter from one of the import merchants of Calcutta, in which the writer said: "As regards, however, practically the whole of what is technically called 'grey cloth,' of which the bulk of the Lancashire imports consists, they are used by the same class of consumers as take the production of the Indian mills, and if they can, owing to their passing free of duty, obtain the latter on more favourable terms than the former, then unquestionably the tendency will be towards a decrease in the demand for those least favourably situated." Further on Sir James Westland said: "Another document which I only received last night comes from Manchester. It says, after referring to the argument which the Manchester merchants put forward, in which they asserted that the relief of goods under 20's, was sure to react in the form of restricting the demand for goods over 20's. On Tuesday I had a very remarkable confirmation of my opinion in the shape of two pieces manufactured by one of the Petit group of mills at Bombay from 20's yarns, which have totally supplanted an English-made cloth, the yarns being 28's in the twist (the 'reed' threads) and 32's in the weft (the 'pick' threads). The remarkable feature of this case is the wide difference in the yarns and the 'reed' and 'pick' of the substituted and supplanted cloths. That 20's should be substituted for 22's or 24's and 12 or 13 threads per quarter inch for 14 or 15 we were quite prepared for, but that substitution should have at once gone so far we did not expect." These are two pieces of further evidence received since the Bill was introduced, and confirm the view the Government of India has taken in this matter, and on which it has based its policy, that there is no permanent solution of the difficulty in any system which will leave a dividing line at any point, and tax the cloth which is above that line, and exempt from the tax the cloth which is below it. The moment differential treatment was attempted difficulties arose. The one thing which trade was afraid of, and which paralysed it, was a fear of legislation which would alter existing terms of competition. So long as taxation was to be on perfectly equitable terms, whether the tax was raised or whether it was lowered did not very much matter to the competitors, because both could compete on perfectly equal terms. But the moment they differentiated by legislation the result was to bring the two competing industries directly into conflict with each other. That had been one of the troubles in the past, and, warned by the past, the Government had, after looking into this question from the Imperial and broadest point of view, felt that they must not have recourse to legislation which would bring two great industrial communities, not only into trade competition, but into political competition with one another. (Hear, hear.) Then the hon. baronet said that he brought forward this motion in the interests of the poor, but, if they looked for the source of such proposals, they could often be traced to the Bombay millowners. He, for one, had not the least objection to the case of the Bombay millowners, or any other millowners, being properly represented before that House, and they were entitled to perfect justice and equality of treatment; but it should not be said that their case was put forward in the interests of commerce. Had the hon. baronet ever attempted to find out what proportions of cloth the power looms in India supplied to the population? If not he would be surprised to hear how small the proportion was. He had some figures showing the proportions of yarn consumed by the power looms and by the hand looms, which he would lay before the House. The power looms, it was estimated, consumed 78 million pounds of yarn, and the hand looms consumed 311 million pounds of yarn. It was further estimated that the imports from Lancashire amounted to no less than 308 million pounds of yarn; and, therefore, out of upwards of 650 million pounds of yarn woven into cloth, the power looms of India only absorbed 78 millions, or, in other words, they scarcely supplied 10 per cent. of the cloth which was consumed in India. It was quite a mistake to assume, as the hon. baronet did, that the coarser cloths were worn by the poor, who, whether for reasons of cost or of greater durability, bought the cloths imported from England. The tariff which had been introduced reduced the burden of taxation upon the consumer, the tax upon imported goods having been reduced by 3½ per cent. He had not a reliable statement of what proportion of imported cloth was consumed by the poor of India, but he was perfectly certain that more than half of it was bought by them. The enormous mass of yarn utilised by hand looms was free from taxation, and consequently the products were cheaper than they had been. (Hear, hear.) He thought he had shown that the proposal of the hon. baronet was one to which the House could not assent. He owned that he felt great satisfaction at having been able to bring about an arrangement that put an end to the agitation which previously existed, and he believed that arrangement was a perfectly fair one. The hon. gentleman who spoke second told them that a great many people in India objected to it, but he did not tell them what their arguments were. It was the misfortune of these trade disputes that the natural sympathies of those residing in the localities where the industries were situated were always in favour of that industry. It was a matter of sentiment rather than of argument, and that had in the past constituted the main danger of this question. So far as he knew this agitation had absolutely quieted down. It was seen now that they had made a just and fair settlement, and the proposal of the hon. baronet, though a small one in itself, would in reality knock away the keystone of the system which had superseded that which was previously in force. For these reasons he hoped that the House would not only reject the proposal which the hon. baronet had made but, inasmuch as he had brought forward no arguments in support of it, that they would not consider it necessary to continue the debate at any length. In supporting the Government the House would endorse the view that they had contrived to bring about an equitable and judicial solution of as contentious a matter as could be brought before any Government. (Cheers.)

Sir H. FOWLER said the three speeches which had been delivered had severally illustrated the extreme inconvenience of the mode in which this question had been brought before the House. There had been no notice upon the paper, and there had been no intimation except a rumour in the Press that possibly this question might be forwarded within forty-eight hours.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said that he had sent an intimation to the leader of the Opposition.

Sir H. FOWLER said the right hon. gentleman only received that intimation that morning, and he did not conceive that to be an intimation to the House, which was entitled to have full notice. This question, the gravity of which it was impossible to exaggerate, had been brought before them in a manner which he thought prejudiced it, and which would tend to produce an unfortunate effect in India. He should be prepared, at the proper time and under proper circumstances, to defend his own action and also to criticise what had been done since he held office; but hon. members had not had this Blue-book in their hands many hours, and for his own part he candidly confessed that he had not had time to carefully read it. He knew nothing of the correspondence which had passed between the noble lord opposite and the Government of India; he was only aware that certain proposals had been adopted which really carried out in their main character his own original proposal. The old controversy had been raised between Lancashire and India, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the question as to the limit of the amount of the excise duty which had been levied by the Government had also been raised. He wished to point out to the House that these were grave questions which ought to be discussed in a regular manner, so that the House could arrive at a decision which would carry some weight with it. They were asked to vote upon the question "That this House do now adjourn," but could anybody undertake to explain to the people of India what that meant? Practically it was a vote of censure upon the Government for the action they had taken, and which had received the approval of the Legislative Council of India. It was suggested that the noble lord should withhold his assent from this Bill, which, no doubt, originally emanated to a great extent from himself, or had his full approval. He had no doubt the noble lord had followed what Lord Salisbury laid down in his celebrated despatch as to the relative positions of the Legislative Council and the Secretary of State, and the great mischief which would accrue to the public interests, and especially to commercial interests, if there was any collision between those two powers. No doubt the Legislative Council fully understood what the noble lord was going to do. They could not suppose that the noble lord was going to upset the work of his own hands, or that the Legislative Council was going to repeal what it has just passed. If the noble lord were to adopt the suggestion that he should arbitrarily annul what he had presumably assented to only within the last three months, that would be a course deserving of the censure of the House, and would be without precedent and incapable of defence. (Hear, hear.) He deprecated this premature, immature, and inconclusive debate. He was, he believed, as strong a party fighting man as any man on that side of the House, but he never would consent to throw India into the vortex of our party politics. At this moment, when they had a fight with the Government on a question in regard to which strong party feeling was aroused, and when they were on the eve of another party political fight of perhaps greater magnitude, there was no pressing necessity to throw this question into the cauldron of political strife, and if it were done it would, he believed, produce a very unfortunate effect. He hoped his hon. friend would not go to a division, but if he did the result would be that the House, without any opportunity of fairly and fully discussing the papers, would commit itself to an approval of the action of the Secretary of State. The hon. baronet said that the action of the noble lord was very much disapproved in India; he knew nothing at all about that, but if that were so how important it was that their decision upon this question should not be arrived at in a hurry. The discussion of this question ought not to have a party aspect. He should decline to defend his own action or censure that of the party opposite. He hoped they should not have a revival of the controversy between Manchester and India until they had an opportunity first of seeing and reading what Lancashire wants, and what was the reply of the Chambers of Commerce and especially of India as to the case put forward by Manchester. Lancashire members had a right to be heard. Reference had been made to the admirable speech of the Finance Minister of India, and by chance he had come upon this passage:—"I have heard it argued, and it has been argued to-day, that they are in some respects precisely the classes who ought to contribute to present necessities; inasmuch as the same fall in the rupee which has rendered it necessary for us to enlarge our revenue has been to them a source of advantage. To them it means higher prices for their agricultural produce, and more active trade in carrying it away to the markets. Those who argue about oppressiveness of taxation and the inability of these classes to meet the demand, altogether forget, it seems to me, the figures with which they are dealing. The whole tax which we intend to obtain by Cotton Duties is put down at 105 lakhs of rupees; the number of people who pay it—for nearly every soul in India wears cotton cloths—is something like 287 millions; and the result of these two figures is to show that the average contribution of each person in the tax is about seven pies, a little over half an anna. It is a tax which by the nature of its application is to some extent graduated according to the means of the payer, and we may safely say that the vast mass of the population to which I have referred will not be called on to pay on the average more than half an anna, and that the poorest classes—those who cannot afford to indulge in even such minor luxuries as a good *dhuti*—will not have to pay, even if they used taxed cloth, more than a quarter as much, or, say, one pie and a half. To talk of this as oppressive taxation is a misuse of words." (Hear, hear.) He was sorry to have interposed in that debate, but he thought it due to the House to make these few remarks. (Hear, hear.) The changes made by the noble lord were of great gravity and they could not be properly discussed on a motion for the adjournment. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GEORGE WHITELEY agreed as to the great inconvenience that must ensue if this subject was to be sprung upon the House in this manner. The Motion appeared to be based upon the argument that the consequence of the alteration of the duties would be an increase of taxation upon the poor of India. He should like to know at what percentage the hon. baronet fixed the poor of India? He did not think he should be over-stating the facts if he were to put it at 80 per cent. or 90 per cent., and yet the noble lord had pointed out that the amount of duty-free goods consumed in India previous to the alteration of the duties was only one-tenth of the total consumption. Unless the hon. Baronet was prepared to argue that the poor classes of India were not more than one-tenth of the whole population, the superstructure he had raised was entirely dissipated. (Hear, hear.) At present all the people of India were called upon to pay was 3½ per cent. additional taxation upon one-tenth of their consumption, whereas they were relieved to the extent of 1½ per cent. upon nine-tenths of their consumption. The position of Lancashire was clear. They had pointed to the increasing and fierce competition taking place between India and Lancashire. They had showed that, whilst they in Lancashire had a retrogressive and stagnant trade, in India there was a developing and progressive trade. They had stated that, while in Lancashire millions of spindles were stopped, in India the cotton factories were paying dividends of from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent., and that during the year subsequent to the imposition of these duties the shares of the Bombay mills increased in value to the extent of 1,600,000 tens of rupees. Taking those facts into consideration, it could not be argued that India was suffering. It had been contended and proved that the duties were protective. Up to 20's counts they were absolutely protective. The hon. member gave an example of the way in which an inferior article made in India was made to pass as of Lancashire manufacture, but said he would not enlarge upon this matter, as it would be brought out if a debate rose upon the question. They had got what they claimed and asked for. They had asked that their position should be rendered identical with that of the Indian manufacturer, and that there should be an equalisation of duties. In granting them that, he thought the noble lord had removed the bone of contention between Lancashire and India—(hear, hear)—and they now joined hands with the Indian manufacturers in an attempt to get the whole of the duties abolished. The imposition of the duties in India had been referred to as costly and vexatious. It had also been said that this was protection in favour of the hand-loom manufacturer against the power-loom manufacturer. A duty of 3½ per cent. was protective, in the mind of the hon. baronet, when it came between the power-loom manufacturer and the hand-loom manufacturer, but, according to his contention, and that of many hon. members on the same side of the House, a 5 per cent. duty was not protective when it was imposed upon Lancashire goods against Indian goods. (Hear, hear.) Agitation and excitement had, no doubt, taken place in India, but he believed, from representations he had had, that they had died down. They also took place in Lancashire when the people felt they were being treated in a distinctly unfair manner. (Hear, hear.) He believed the present arrangement was one agreeable to the manufacturers of both Lancashire and India. Whether the duties rose or fell was a matter of no importance to Lancashire manufacturers so long as they were not placed at a disadvantage in competition with Indian manufacturers in the Indian markets, and they all paid alike. (Cheers.)

Mr. STANHOPE suggested to the hon. baronet the propriety of withdrawing his motion, as he considered that the time of introducing it was not judiciously selected. He agreed with the hon. member for Stockport as to the reasonable measure of contentment resulting from the action of the Government in altering the duties, but he still hoped to see them entirely removed, as altogether undesirable. That question had best be discussed, however, when the financial affairs of India were debated, and he hoped that that time would be early. The hon. baronet, the member for Dundee, a little exercised in his mind by what had taken place in the House last summer, took a trip to Bombay last winter, dined with a number of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

gentlemen connected with the trade of Bombay, and came back impressed with the notion that the Lancashire people were most selfish. On that point he must have some better evidence than that supplied by the hon. baronet.

Mr. BALFOUR moved that the question be now put.

The SPEAKER: Surely it will not be necessary to put such a motion after the speeches which have been made on both sides of the House.

Mr. LOUGH thought his hon. friend would act wisely if he withdrew his motion, but he hoped the leader of the House would give them a promise that the Indian Budget should be brought on at a time when this subject could be adequately discussed.

Mr. BALFOUR said that no one was more anxious than he that the Indian Budget should come on at a time when Indian matters could be adequately discussed, but he was not the obstacle to the progress of business. He felt that this was not a time when this subject could be properly discussed, and therefore he hoped the House would dispose of the motion without a division. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN understood the right hon. gentleman would do his utmost to bring on the Indian Budget on an early day, and therefore asked leave to withdraw his motion.

The motion was then, by leave, withdrawn.

May 19th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer by whom the extraordinary expenses of the Indian contingent at Suakin were to be borne.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I stated the other day in reply to the right hon. gentleman the member for West Monmouthshire that these expenses would be a matter of arrangement between the Egyptian Government and Her Majesty's Government, and I have nothing as yet to add to that statement.

Subsequently,

Sir C. DILKE asked whether it was intended to take the motion on as to the employment of the Indian troops before the question was settled as to which country would pay the ordinary charge.

Mr. BALFOUR said that it was not necessary to settle which country would bear the charge before the House came to a conclusion in regard to the employment of the troops.

Mr. J. MORLEY said that the resolution which was put on the paper last night by the Secretary for India differed in form from that adopted in 1885, inasmuch as the words "unless funds otherwise provided" had been introduced. They could not discuss that question very well until they understood what other provision besides that made by Parliament was left open.

Mr. BALFOUR: The right hon. gentleman will please bear in mind that the object of the resolution and the protection it gives is to prevent Indian funds being touched for this purpose and that object is satisfactorily accomplished by the resolution, and the question of who has to bear the particular charge will not be affected by the discussion of the resolution.

Sir C. DILKE: Is it not the case that the question of the Indian funds is at issue.

Mr. BALFOUR: Yes, the Indian funds.

Sir C. DILKE: The question whether Egypt or India is to pay the ordinary charge being left open, the matter cannot be concluded by the debate.

Mr. BALFOUR: That is not left open. What is left open is whether Egypt or England is to pay.

May 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STAFF-CORPS OFFICERS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would consider the advisability of extending temporary promotion to the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major, which had recently been accorded to staff corps officers serving as commandants and seconds in command of Native regiments, to staff corps officers serving in the military departments under the Government of India, with a view to placing them on an equal footing as regards temporary promotion with their comrades in regimental employment.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The position of officers serving in the military department under the Government of India is not analogous to that of the commandants and seconds in command of Native regiments, and I do not consider it necessary to extend to them the temporary promotion to the ranks of lieutenant-colonel and major recently granted to the latter class of officers.

OFFICERS ON THE GENERAL LIST.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that the Government had taken all the time of the House on Tuesday, 12th May, for which day a motion in regard to the grievances of the officers of the general list had the first place, he would consent to the appointment of a small select committee to enquire into the injustice of which these officers complain.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I understand my hon. friend's question to relate only to the officers now on the general list, but in my opinion it would be quite impossible to confine any enquiry to these officers alone. It must necessarily be extended to all those who have already retired, accepting as final the repeated decisions of the Secretary of State on this subject. Every officer's case would have to be reconsidered. The case of the officers of the general list was discussed in this House in 1888, and has been repeatedly considered by successive Secretaries of State, who have always held that these officers had no claim whatever to the concession granted in 1866 to the staff corps and to officers who formerly belonged to the East India Company's army. Concurring as I do in this view, I am afraid that I cannot consent to the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the case.

THE UNCOVENANTED SERVICES.

Mr. BARNES asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had sanctioned the orders contained in the resolution of the Government of India, dated 22nd June, 1895, under which in future only half the service of certain Indian uncovenanted officers before a certain date (11th December, 1893) would be allowed to count towards furlough, though formerly all such service was counted:

Whether he was aware that the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, and subsequent authoritative statements, had encouraged these officers to expect concessions instead of restrictions in regard to their furlough rules:

And whether the correspondence on the subject of the grievances of the Indian Uncovenanted Civil Services would be laid upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The orders to which the hon. member refers did not require the sanction of the Secretary of State, but were reported for information. Having regard to the circumstances, I see no reason for disapproving them. The new rules must be regarded as a whole, and no officer need come under these unless he chooses to do so. The correspondence is voluminous and not quite complete; but I shall offer no objection to a motion for a Return in continuation of No. 168 of 1892 as soon as the despatch now under consideration shall have reached the Government of India.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

Mr. BALFOUR, in making a statement of the intentions of the Government for the business of the House after the Whitsuntide recess, said that it was proposed to take the resolution with regard to the Indian troops for the Sudan on Thursday, June 4th.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 5. JULY, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from June 1st to June 25th.

Imperial Parliament.

June 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUDAN EXPEDITION.

Mr. J. MORLEY asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he could now lay upon the Table any correspondence between Her Majesty's Government and the Governments of Germany and Italy relating to recent affairs in the Sudan. In putting this question to the right hon. gentleman he would ask him whether he was aware that the Italian Government had laid before the Italian Parliament a Green-book containing despatches and communications bearing upon this very important subject which might perhaps guide Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. CURZON: Yes, Sir; in reply to the last question of the right hon. gentleman, I am well aware that a Green-book has been laid before the Italian Parliament, and I am also familiar with its contents, but it cannot be accurately described as relating for the most part to recent affairs in the Sudan—(cries of "Oh" and hear, hear)—and therefore it does not bear upon this question. In reply to the first question, I have to say that there has been no correspondence answering to this description with Germany. The correspondence with Italy has referred almost exclusively to military operations, and could not, therefore, at the present time be produced.

Mr. J. MORLEY: In reference to the right hon. gentleman's answer to my second question, we, of course, in this Parliament have had no opportunity of reading the Green-book, but some of us, I believe, possess copies of it privately procured, and we have had access, of course, to the *précis* of the contents of that book published in one or two of the London newspapers. I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether he considers it possible for us to enter into the discussion which we hope to have on the subject on Thursday next without knowing what communications have passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Italian Government, and without knowing whether the *précis* of these communications as reported—the *précis* of the reports in the Green-book—are authentic or not. Surely it is impossible—(cries of "Order!")—for us to discuss the matter unless we are placed on equal terms with the Italian Parliament?

Mr. CURZON: That is rather a difficult and complex question to answer without notice, but it does not occur to me that the discussion on Thursday next on the question of the employment of Indian troops in Suakin is at all necessarily connected with matters that have already appeared in the Italian Green-book. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. MORLEY: I should, of course, be out of order if I were to attempt to argue that point. Thursday will be the occasion for arguing it. But are we to understand from the right hon. gentleman that we are not to have the same communications that the Italian Government thought proper to make upon the African question to the Italian Parliament?

Mr. CURZON: No, Sir; I believe there is no present intention of laying before this Parliament papers which have already been laid before the Italian Parliament.

Mr. T. G. BOWLES asked whether, having seen the Italian Green-book, the right hon. gentleman was aware that in that book there were several despatches, and drafts of despatches, by Lord Salisbury, and that in one case where the draft of a despatch was submitted to the Italian Government they complained of it, and it was subsequently corrected by Lord Salisbury? Is the right hon. gentleman also aware——

The SPEAKER: Order, order. That is a question of which notice should be given.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: May I ask the right hon. gentleman, on the same subject, whether he can lay in the library of the House a copy of the Italian Green-book? I gather from what the right hon. gentleman says that he has it.

Mr. CURZON: I do not know whether any copies are available in the Foreign Office; I have only seen one copy myself, but if there are copies available I shall be very happy to comply with the request of the hon. member.

Mr. T. G. BOWLES: Will the right hon. gentleman give us those English despatches which are published in the Green-book?

Mr. CURZON: No, Sir; I cannot, without the authority of the Secretary of State, agree to give any despatches at all. I have already answered the question put to me on that point, and have endeavoured to explain that the discussion on Thursday does not appear to me to turn on the questions arising out of that Green-book.

Mr. T. G. BOWLES: I will put down the same question for to-morrow.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I do not wish to be discourteous to the right hon. gentleman, but is he not aware that Lord Salisbury in another place, on the 17th of March, said that there had been considerable communications—that was his expression—with the Italian Government? However, I will put another question on the paper to the right hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. CURZON: Yes, Sir; but may I just on that point say that the considerable communications have been for the most part by word of mouth, and such communications it is impossible to lay before the House.

Sir C. DILKE: With reference to the question of the hon. member for King's Lynn, has not Lord Salisbury's assent to the publication of all despatches been asked in the usual way by the Italian Government, and may not the Under-Secretary

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of State therefore assume that the despatches laid before the Italian Parliament may be laid before this House?

Mr. BALFOUR: I think it must be evident to the House that it is very inconvenient that the Under Secretary should be pressed without notice for an answer to such questions. After all, there are two days before the debate comes on in regard to the Suakin troops, and I would beg the right hon. gentleman to put the question down on the paper.

June 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS FOR THE SUDAN.

THE RESOLUTION POSTPONED.

Mr. J. MORLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would, before Thursday, lay before the House any telegrams that had passed with the Government of India as to the despatch of an Indian force to Suakin.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Although I could not give the telegrams, yet Her Majesty's Government consider that the House should be in possession of the views of the Indian Government before any discussion takes place upon the despatch of Indian troops to Suakin, and I am considering how that object can best be attained.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I may say that I only put the word "telegrams" in the question because I understood the noble lord the other day promised my right hon. friend and hon. friends behind me that the telegrams should be produced.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the right hon. gentleman whether he had arranged with the home Government that all charges for extra allowances, pensions, or gratuities to officers or soldiers of the Indian force sent to Suakin, and charges for pensions or gratuities to the families of officers or soldiers of the force killed or disabled during the expedition, should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer; and whether, to avoid loss by delay in the settlement of accounts between the two Governments, he would secure, as was done when the Indian troops went to Malta, an advance from the Treasury to cover temporary outlays by India on Imperial account.

Lord G. HAMILTON: It has been arranged that all extra expenses shall be borne by the Treasury, and this term includes such charges as are mentioned in the first part of the question.

As soon as an estimate can be obtained from India as to the amount of extra expenditure incurred on Imperial account, application will be made to the Treasury for an advance.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the right hon. gentleman what was the nature and number of the force of all arms that was being sent from India to Suakin.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The force consists of:—

	British Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers.	Natives of all ranks.
One Regiment Native Cavalry ..	13	500
One Native Mountain Battery ..	5	265
One Company Sappers and Miners ..	7	168
Two Regiments Native Infantry ..	26	1,474
Total	51	2,407

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he would lay upon the Table any Despatches from Her Majesty's Government relating to East African affairs, which had recently been laid before the Italian Parliament.

Mr. CURZON: I shall be happy to lay upon the Table any despatches which answer the description of the right hon. gentleman. I do not, however, think there are more than one or two.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether Her Majesty's Government had given attention to the Green Book recently published by the Italian Government, containing correspondence relative to Italian proceedings in Africa;

Whether, on 19th February, 1896, Her Majesty's Government submitted confidentially to the Italian Ambassador in London the draft of a despatch proposed to be sent by Lord Salisbury in reply to a letter from Ras Mangasha, the son of King John of Abyssinia:

Whether, at the request of the Italian Ambassador in London, Her Majesty's Government corrected the draft despatch, and on 28th February, 1896, submitted to the Ambassador another and different draft, containing the declaration that Italy was the friend and ally of this country:

Whether the consent of Her Majesty's Government to the publication of its despatches and drafts was asked for and obtained by the Italian Government before publishing the same:

And, whether Her Majesty's Government propose to lay before the House the correspondence relative to the Italian operations in Africa, including any despatches which passed between the Italian Government and Lord Rosebery's Administration.

Mr. CURZON: The answer to the first and second paragraphs is in the affirmative. In answer to the third paragraph Her Majesty's Government is on friendly terms with the Government of Italy and also with the Government of Abyssinia. But it would clearly be improper that we should at the present juncture lay before the House the language which we have used in any attempts we may have made to improve the relations of those two Powers. The answer to the fourth paragraph is in the negative. As to the fifth paragraph. The present opportunity is not a fitting one for laying papers on the Table of the House dealing with operations still pending. When peace is restored the Government will be happy to consider what papers can properly be laid on the Table.

Mr. T. G. BOWLES: With regard to the third paragraph of the question, I think there is some confusion. May I ask whether the right hon. gentleman can answer categorically that paragraph?

Mr. CURZON: That is the paragraph I have answered in the negative, and no further reply is necessary. (Laughter.)

Mr. T. G. BOWLES: That is no answer at all.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES then asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in December, 1895, Her Majesty's Government received a request from the Italian Government to allow Italian troops to be disembarked and to pass through Zeila in order to operate against the Abyssinians, which request was supported by Count Hatzfeldt, the German Ambassador in London:

Whether the India Office opposed the giving of this consent, but was overruled by Lord Salisbury:

Whether Lord Salisbury, on 25th February, 1896, telegraphed to Aden to authorise the examination by Italian officers of Duncareta roads as an anchorage for Italian vessels of war:

Whether the delay of this authorisation to that date was due to the opposition of the India Office, which was overruled by Lord Salisbury:

Whether he could say on what grounds the India Office opposed the landing of Italian troops at Zeila and the examination of the anchorage at Duncareta, and on what grounds Lord Salisbury overruled the opposition:

And, whether Her Majesty's Government proposed to lay upon the Table of this House the Correspondence on these subjects.

Mr. CURZON: Certain facilities were asked for by the Italian Government, which involved a permission to pass through some portions of Her Majesty's Somali Coast Protectorate. After consultation with the Indian Government Her Majesty's Government expressed their willingness to concur in this suggestion subject to the limitations necessary to prevent it from trenching on the rights of other Powers. No final conclusion was arrived at, but the details of the negotiations involved questions at issue with the Governments of Italy and France, and the *de facto* Government of Harrar, and I do not think the matter is one on which the House will require me to give fuller details.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: With regard to all these depatches did I not understand the right hon. gentleman to say in the discussion yesterday that he would lay in the Library of the House the Italian Green-book, which contains every despatch which the right hon. gentleman says he will not give to the House of Commons?

Mr. CURZON: The hon. gentleman is not correct in both the statements which he has made. I said I would lay the Green-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

book if I found that there was more than one copy at the Foreign Office. I find there is only one copy—(laughter)—and that is under examination by myself. (Renewed laughter.) As to the second part of the question the despatches which I have promised to lay on the Table are those asked for by the right hon. gentleman which have already appeared in the Italian Green-book and of which I think there are but one or two copies.

Mr. T. G. BOWLES: I wish to ask whether he has also received a second Italian Green-book?

Mr. CURZON: I have received more than that; I have received three. (Laughter.)

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether a communication was received by Her Majesty's Government on 10th March from the Italian Ambassador in London, to the effect that the Governor of Massowah had telegraphed that 10,000 Dervishes were said to be hovering around Kassala, and asking whether Her Majesty's Government would decide to make a diversion by an advance on the Nile; whether the next day telegraphic orders were sent to Lord Cromer directing him to make a military diversion towards Dongola; and whether, before the advance was ordered, the Egyptian Government had been consulted on the matter and expressed its approval.

Mr. CURZON: Some time before the communications alluded to by the hon. gentleman, the question of an advance against the Dervishes had been under discussion with the Egyptian Government, who were anxious that such operations should be undertaken in order to insure the security of Egypt. With respect, however, to the time and circumstances of the action which Her Majesty's Government sanctioned, we were undoubtedly influenced by the representations which we received from the Italian Government of the danger to which the Italian position at Kassala was exposed, the fall of which place at that time would have involved a serious menace to the security of Egyptian territory.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Do we understand that Her Majesty's Government had under consideration communications from Egypt as to the threatened advance of the Dervishes before the 10th of March—that is to say, before the Italian Ambassador waited upon Lord Salisbury?

Mr. CURZON: Yes, Sir. There had been communications between Her Majesty's Government and Lord Cromer on behalf of the Egyptian Government prior to that date as to the danger to Egyptian territory if a Dervish victory or a Dervish advance occurred.

Sir C. DILKE: Are the Government under present circumstances still of opinion that Lord Cromer's despatches cannot be laid before Parliament?

Mr. CURZON: I do not understand how that question arises, and I do not think it desirable to depart from the ordinary custom in regard to this matter.

Sir C. DILKE: It arises out of the answer just given. The right hon. gentleman alluded to despatches communicated through Lord Cromer as to the views of the Egyptian Government in regard to an advance by the Dervishes. Cannot they be laid before Parliament?

Mr. CURZON: No, I cannot depart from the ordinary rule.

Mr. BALFOUR: I have to state with regard to the arrangements made for the debate on the subject of the employment of Indian troops in Egypt, that my noble friend the Secretary of State for India communicated to me after Question time last night, a telegraphic message which he had received from the Indian Government, earnestly pressing that the matter should not be gone on with until Her Majesty's Government had received and considered a despatch embodying their views on the subject. That is a request which we cannot refuse, and under those circumstances I am afraid I must ask the House to pass from the arrangement fixed for Thursday, and allow the matter to stand over to a later day.

Mr. J. MORLEY said that the House was, of course, bound to accept the position stated by the right hon. gentleman, but he understood the Secretary of State for India to have stated a few minutes before that he would produce the views of the Indian Government, with a view to the discussion on Thursday.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I said before the discussion took place, not before Thursday.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Oh, I beg pardon; but we ought to have an understanding that the earliest possible day will be found for the discussion of the general subject of the employment of the Indian troops. We hold that the consent of Parliament is a necessary condition to their employment, and we press for an early day, no matter what may be the views of the Indian Government as to the charge for those troops. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BALFOUR: It would be improper for me to argue the the question last raised, but I think the right hon. gentleman will feel that it is absolutely impossible for us to do more than give the earliest day we can after the despatch of the Indian Government has been received, and time has been given to my noble friend to consider it. I do not think that ought to occupy a very long period—not more than a fortnight or three weeks.

Sir W. HARCOURT: I understand that a despatch is coming. How long will it take to reach this country?

Mr. BALFOUR: A fortnight or three weeks.

Sir W. HARCOURT: Does the right hon. gentleman say we shall have no opportunity of discussing the despatch of troops to Suakin apart from the question of who is to pay, which is a subsidiary question altogether? We desire to have an opportunity of discussing the subject of the despatch of the troops.

Mr. BALFOUR: I think the right hon. gentleman will feel that he cannot ask the Government to give two days to this discussion. The right hon. gentleman appears to have forgotten that under his own Government in 1885 the troops were actually engaged before a resolution was brought before the House at all. (Laughter.)

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Then I beg to say that it is not beyond the bounds of probability that we may take a day. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLAN (for Sir E. GOURLEY) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he was aware that, prior to the Nile expedition for the relief of the late General Gordon, the naval and military advisers of the Egyptian Government recommended that a flotilla of ironclad monitors, armed with quick-firing guns, should be built for the purpose of patrolling and holding the Nile as far as the Bahr-el-Ghazal; and whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to construct and despatch in time for the next rising of the Nile craft of this description, and suitable for passing the rapids wholly or otherwise, for the purpose of assisting in the capture of Dongola, Berber, and Khartum.

Mr. GOSCHEN: Three stern-wheel protected steamers are now being built for the Egyptian Government for service on the Nile, and are to be delivered in the course of the next three months. They are specially designed for this service, and will have an armament of quick-firing guns.

THE SUGAR CANE INDUSTRY IN BOMBAY.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India—in view of the fact that the Government of India issued a resolution in 1882 in which they expressed a desire that all possible encouragement should be held out to the development of sugar cane industry in the Bombay Presidency, and the Government of Bombay acting upon this instruction held out hopes in 1883 and 1884 to the proprietor of a sugar refinery in Poona that he would be allowed to effect retail sale of rum (which was a by-product of sugar manufacture) under similar conditions to those which were adopted in Madras and other parts of India, and that in consequence of this privilege being withheld the sugar refinery at Poona had to be closed in 1892—whether, as a means of reviving and developing this industry in Bombay, he would recommend the local governments to give all sugar refineries the privilege of selling rum under the same conditions as prevail at Madras and elsewhere.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no complete information about the Poona sugar factory to which my hon. friend refers, but a copy of his question will be forwarded to the Government of India and their attention will be drawn to the matter.

ALLEGED ILLICIT TRADE IN AMMUNITION.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to statements recently made in the *Pioneer* to the effect that a large illicit trade was carried on in ammunition between the regular Afghan soldiers and the tribesmen in the Hindu Kush, and that during the Chitral campaign a consignment of Kabul made ammunition

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

was sent into Bajour from the Sipah Salar's camp beyond Asmar, also that as regards Martini-Henry rifles the tribes had an abundant supply of cartridges the majority of which had not come from India:

And, whether any measures could be taken by the Government of India, through His Highness the Amir of Afghanistan, to check or prevent such transfer of munitions of war to the tribesmen.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have been unable to trace the statements in the *Pioneer* to which my hon. friend refers, nor have I any official information on the subject. I will, however, make further inquiries.

June 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

On the motion of Sir W. Wedderburn an Address was presented for "Return of Opinions and reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council, under 21 and 22 Vict., c. 106, s. 23, with reference to the despatch of the 2nd day of April, 1896, to the Government of India, leaving to their operations Acts 2 and 3 of 1896 on the subject of the Indian Tariff Act and the Cotton Duties."

RHEA FIBRE.

Sir JOSEPH LEESE asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the recent discovery of Professor Bilderbeck Gomess of an alleged method of treating rhea fibre on an economical and effective basis:

And, having regard to the great importance of such a discovery in connection with both the agricultural and manufacturing industries of India and the Home textile manufactures, if he would cause enquiries to be made with the object of developing the production of this fibre.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My attention has not been called to the process mentioned in the hon. member's question; but if it has a commercial value, I have no doubt that it will receive attention from those who are specially interested in the subject. As at present advised, I see no ground for any official enquiry.

RE-SETTLEMENTS IN JABALPUR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the Jabalpur Division of the Central Provinces the recent re-settlement enhanced the land revenue and other public charges beyond the limitations prescribed by the Government of India, letter No. 451, of 24th August, 1887; whether 60 per cent. was recognised as a reasonable limit of enhancement; and whether the recent enhancements in Jabalpur exceeded 60 per cent. and left no margin of profit to the proprietor:

Whether there was no canal irrigation in the Central Provinces, and that the principal crops had failed for the last three years:

And, whether he would move the Government of India to modify the new settlement, and would suspend its operation for the present, having regard to the existing agricultural distress.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is the fact that the recent enhancements of land revenue in some of the districts of the Jabalpur division have exceeded 60 per cent. It is not the fact that no margin of profit is left to the proprietor. Speaking generally, the share of the rental left to the landlord is everywhere 40 per cent.; in many cases it is 50 per cent. or upwards.

There is no canal irrigation in the Central Provinces. In two districts and part of a third district, out of the eighteen districts which compose the Central Provinces, there has been serious failure or shortness of crop for three years.

Large suspensions and remissions of land revenue have been granted in the two districts of Sangor and Damoli, and partial suspensions elsewhere. I do not propose to move the Government of India to modify the settlement.

"STATE LANDLORDISM IN MADRAS."

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether an answer had been received from the Madras Government to his despatch of 1893 regarding improvements in the system of dealing with land revenue defaulters; if so, whether a further despatch on the subject had been sent to the Madras Government; and whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the whole correspondence, including the letters of Mr. Alexander Rogers, late member of Council in Bombay;

And, whether his attention had been drawn to a tabular statement at page 180 of the current number of the journal INDIA, purporting to set forth, from documents at the India Office, all the material figures as to which he stated that it was necessary to refer to the Government of Madras.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: An answer has been received from the Government of Madras and a further despatch has been sent to them on the subject of land revenue defaulters. There will be no objection to laying on the Table the correspondence when it is concluded. I have not seen the paper to which the hon. member refers in the second paragraph of his question.

WHERE IS THE FRONTIER?

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to a statement in the *Times of India* of 18th April last, that a military force had proceeded from Wana to Haidari, Tach, and Sarwakai, and that military posts were being constructed at those places:

And, whether those places were beyond the external frontiers of British India; and, if so, whether under Section 55 of the Government of India Act of 1858, the consent of both Houses of Parliament would be obtained for this expenditure.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The places mentioned in the hon. member's question are not beyond the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions: the section which he cites, therefore, does not apply to the case.

June 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUDAN EXPEDITION.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the statement in the telegram of 12th March, 1896, as it appeared in the papers recently laid before the Italian Parliament, from the Italian Ambassador in London to the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Rome, was correct, namely, that "Lord Salisbury, after a meeting of the Cabinet, telegraphed to Lord Cromer to take steps for executing a military demonstration towards Dongola, with a view to making a diversion in our favour":

Whether, in taking this decision, Her Majesty's Government acted on the advice of Lord Cromer:

And whether any communication took place with the other European Powers in regard to such a military demonstration, before or after the decision of the Government.

Mr. GEORGE N. CURZON: Lord Cromer was informed by telegraph on March 12th that Her Majesty's Government had decided to authorise an advance of Egyptian troops in the valley of the Nile for the security of the Egyptian frontiers, and also as a diversion in favour of Kassala. As I have twice previously stated in reply to similar questions, Her Majesty's Government had, before this decision was arrived at, been in communication with Lord Cromer and the military authorities in Egypt, who had expressed the opinion that a forward movement against the Dervishes should be made in view of the position of Kassala. No previous consultation took place with the European Powers. But they were informed afterwards that Her Majesty's Government had authorised the advance of Egyptian troops, and the objects of the expedition were explained to them.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I may, perhaps, ask the right hon. gentleman whether there is any serious objection to producing the communication made to Lord Cromer on March 12th.

Mr. CURZON: No doubt the Secretary of State will consider the propriety of including that and any other papers in any collection of documents that may subsequently be laid before the House.

Mr. J. MORLEY: May we know when that collection of papers is likely to be made? (Hear, hear.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Mr. CURZON: That is a question that I cannot answer without notice.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Will the collection of papers also include the communication made to the foreign Powers to which the right hon. gentleman has referred?

Mr. CURZON: That, again, is a matter which, of course, I must submit to the judgment of the Secretary of State.

Mr. COURTNEY: The right hon. gentleman in his principal answer has repeated again the ambiguous word "who." (Hear, hear.) I would ask him if the word "who" in this answer refers to Lord Cromer as well as to the military authorities?

Mr. CURZON: I apologise if my grammar is unacceptable to the House, but, as on previous occasions, so now, the word "who" refers to both parties.

Mr. JOHN MORLEY asked the Secretary of State for India whether the question of the despatch of an Indian force to the Sudan, and of the proportion of the charge of the force, had been considered by the Indian Council.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Both the questions referred to by the right hon. gentleman were considered by the Indian Council before I gave notice of the resolution which is awaiting discussion.

Mr. J. MORLEY: I believe it is the practice in a case of this kind, if there should be any dissentients in the India Council, their names are produced in this House. That was done, I understand, in the case of the cotton duties and the Contagious Diseases Act, and I wish to know will that precedent be followed in the present case?

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not the slightest objection if the right hon. gentlemen wishes them.

Mr. J. MORLEY: Then the noble lord will lay them on the Table of the House?

Lord G. HAMILTON: Yes.

June 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PROGRESS AND CONDITION OF INDIA.

East India (Progress and Condition). Paper (presented 5th June) to be printed. [No. 218.]

THE ARREST ON A HAIDARABAD RAILWAY.

Mr. PICKERSGILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the case of Mr. Yusufuddin, a talukdar in the service of the Haidarabad State, who was recently arrested at a railway station in His Highness the Nizam's dominions, under the authority of a warrant issued by a British magistrate in the Punjab:

Could he state what was the precise nature of the charge against Mr. Yusufuddin:

Were there any precedents for effecting an arrest, under the warrant of a British magistrate, on railway property in India outside British territory, except for offences committed on or in connexion with railways or railway trains:

Was there any statutory authority under which the warrant against Mr. Yusufuddin could be executed in the circumstances stated:

And, if the warrant was executed in virtue of an administrative regulation of the railway department, would he suggest to the Indian Government the propriety of placing the procedure in such cases on a statutory basis.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My attention has been drawn to the case, and I find that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has given leave to enter an appeal raising the question whether the arrest was legal.

I cannot enter into any discussion of a matter which is *sub judice*.

REPORTED EXECUTION OF INDIAN MERCHANTS.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been drawn to a report of the execution of twenty-three leading Indian merchants at Kilwa, in German East Africa, for alleged complicity in a rebellious rising in that district:

And if he could give any information on the subject.

Mr. GEORGE CURZON: We have heard nothing at the Foreign Office of the alleged execution of Indian merchants at Kilwa, nor have I seen anywhere the report to which my hon. friend alludes.

June 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, pending appeal, it would be necessary to find for the Egyptian operations in the Sudan and for the Indian expedition to Suakin monies other than those held by the mixed tribunals to have been illegally advanced by Mr. Money and others from the Reserve Fund:

And, whether it was intended by Her Majesty's Government to invite Parliament to come to the help of the Egyptian Government in respect of such charges.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The answer to the first part of the question is no. So far as the Egyptian operations are concerned, the extraordinary expenses of the Indian garrison in the Sudan will, I think, in accordance with the usual practice, be defrayed out of the Treasury chest. Of course in what way the Treasury chest will be repaid is a question for future consideration. The second question is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. DALZIEL inquired whether they were to understand that the right hon. gentleman adhered to the declaration he made in introducing the Budget.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Certainly. Of course at that time I did not anticipate the decision of the tribunal. That decision is subject to appeal, and I have every hope it will be set aside.

Sir C. DILKE: Without desiring to press the Government to-day on a matter which they state is under consideration, will they be prepared to tell us, at all events soon, what is the rate of expenditure and from what actual source it is being met at the present time?

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The Egyptian expenditure is, of course, being met by Egyptian funds, which are by no means limited to the £500,000 which has been already advanced.

Mr. DALZIEL: Will this be the case until the appeal is heard which, I understand, will not be until October? Will that be the source in the meantime?

The SPEAKER: I think notice should be given of that question.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Perhaps I may be allowed to say that there is nothing in what has occured which makes any difference, in my opinion, in the position in which we at present stand.

June 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Singh, Sirdar Bhai Jasmir.—Petition from Cis Sutlej, for inquiry into his case, to lie upon the Table.

June 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

MINUTES OF THE INDIAN COUNCIL.

On the motion of Mr. JOHN MORLEY, a return was granted of opinions and reasons entered in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Secretary of State of India in Council, on the 16th day of May, under 21 and 22 Vict., c. 106, s. 23, with reference to the expenses of the troops to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. ARTHUR PEASE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any further information on the subject of the Amír's action in Kafiristan.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received a letter from the Government of India on the whole subject referred to in the hon. member's question, and I shall be happy to lay the correspondence upon the Table if the hon. member will move for it.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Mr. GIBSON BOWLES asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he could state the amount of the cash balance at present in the Treasury chest:

Whether it was in accordance with the Treasury chest Regulations to make, out of that chest, advances to the Indian Government for the ordinary or extraordinary expenses of Indian troops, or for the direct payment of such expenses:

Whether he proposed to submit to this House a vote to provide the money for repayment to the Treasury chest of any sums he might expend out of that chest for the expedition to Suakin of Indian troops:

And, whether there was any precedent for paying the expense of a military expedition out of the Treasury chest without such expedition having previously been sanctioned by Parliament.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The exact cash balance in the Treasury chest fund at any particular moment cannot be stated, as it depends on the balances in the hands of several accounting officers in the various parts of the world. The answer to the second paragraph of the question is yes. The Act of 1877 authorises the Treasury to employ the fund in making temporary advances for any public service, to be repaid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament to such service, or "out of any other moneys applicable thereto." Any advance out of the chest on account of the expedition at Suakin must, therefore, be repaid either by a vote of this House or by the Egyptian Government. The answer to the last paragraph of the question is yes.

June 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

East India (Indian Tariff Act and the Cotton Duties),—Return (presented 11th June), to be printed. (No. 229.)

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

East India (Kafiristan),—On the motion of Mr. Arthur Pease, a Return was granted of "Copies of Correspondence relating to Afghan proceedings in Kafiristan."

June 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RETIREMENT OF UNCOVENANTED OFFICERS.

Mr. BARNES asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India had been moved to reduce the minimum service of uncovenanted officers for voluntary retirement on pension from 30 years to 25, in accordance with the evidence of the financial representative of the India Office before the Select Committee of the House, and in accordance with the observations of the Chairman of that Committee, then Under Secretary of State for India.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Secretary of State has made no such suggestion to the Government of India.

I may add that I have not been able to trace the statements to which my honourable friend refers in support of the change which he apparently advocates.

THE JHALAWAR CASE.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state when the Jhalawar Deposition Papers would be laid upon the Table of the House:

Whether he could inform the House as to what arrangements had been made for the Mahárájá's future and allowances:

And whether the son of the deposed Mahárájá would be treated as the future ruler of the State of Jhalawar.

Lord GEO. HAMILTON: The Papers to be presented are in type, and will be laid on the Table as soon as the Printers can finish the work.

The question of succession, which involves some difficult issues, and the final arrangements for the late Mahárájá Ráná's residence and allowances, are engaging the attention of the Government of India.

THE INDIA MEDAL.

Captain CHALONER asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, inasmuch as the India Medal was given for the 1863 Waziri expedition, and also for the 1895 expedition against the same tribe, when the only fight (viz.: at Wano) was previous to the expedition being sent, and out of which it arose he would consider the question with a view to granting the India Medal to those who took part in the 1881 expedition, in which there was a fight.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I can only refer my hon. friend to the reply given by my predecessor to a somewhat similar question on the 23rd July, 1894, nor could I re-open the question by reconsidering the request to grant a medal for an expedition which took place fifteen years ago.

June 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE TENURE OF REGIMENTAL COMMANDS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether any recommendations had been received from the Commander-in-Chief in India in favour of granting to any officer or officers who had been in actual command of Native regiments for the regulation period of seven years an extension of command for one or two years:

Whether there was any precedent for such an extension of command in the case of the completion of seven years' service in the Indian Army:

Whether his attention had been called to the fact that an assurance had been given by the Secretary of State for War that in the British Army, when tenure of regimental command was limited by the regulations to four years, in every case when two years' extension was allowed by Royal Warrant and asked for, the manner in which extension would affect the promotion of officers of lower rank would be carefully considered:

Whether he was aware that, even with the tenure of command limited to seven years, there would be many officers now serving as Squadron and Wing Commanders who would never obtain a full period of command, and that if this tenure was extended their chances of attaining the command would be still further diminished:

And whether he would give a similar assurance to the Indian Army to that given to the British Army, that no extensions of command would be sanctioned without a careful consideration of the effect of such extension upon the prospects of officers of lower ranks.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The extensions of the tenure of regimental commands referred to in the first question are permissible under the Indian regulations in certain cases. They are granted at the discretion of the Government of India on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief in India, and do not require the sanction or approval of the Secretary of State.

No other extensions have ever been granted.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, with regard to the exchange compensation allowance, it had been decided that those officers whose salaries were regulated by statute would not only be debarred from receiving the allowance in future but would be called upon to refund moneys already received.

Whether, if this decision had been arrived at by the Government of India, consideration had been given to the ruinous effect of requiring officers, to whom the Government had been paying the compensation for years, without demur, on the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ground admitted generally in the case of Indian Civil Servants that they were fairly entitled to some compensation for the loss to which they were subjected by the fall in the exchange, to recoup out of their diminished salaries considerable arrears of money which they had received under Government sanction and expended in good faith:

And, whether he would reconsider the decision.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The question as to the possibility of granting exchange compensation allowance to officers whose salaries are regulated by statute is a legal one: and I believe that the Government of India are now giving their attention to it. Until the legal question shall have been finally settled, no decision on the question of refunding will be taken.

INDIAN IMMIGRANTS IN REUNION.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table the report of Mr More Molyneux on the question of the emigration of coolies from India to Réunion:

And, whether, before a decision to sanction the re-opening of coolie immigration into Réunion was arrived at, the House would be afforded an opportunity of passing an opinion on any scheme that might be proposed.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The report alluded to is probably by Mr. Muir Mackenzie who was deputed by the Government of India to examine into the condition of the Indian Immigrants in Réunion.

The Report is a confidential document, and I am sorry that I cannot present it. The question whether emigration to Réunion may be resumed is one for diplomatic negotiation and I cannot say more than that no reopening of the coolie emigration can be sanctioned unless I am satisfied as to the conditions under which it can be resumed.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received a despatch from the Government of India expressing the views of that Government on the agreement with reference to Siam recently concluded between France and England:

And, whether he would lay any such despatch upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A despatch has recently been received on this subject from the Indian Government and if my hon. friend moves for it I will lay it upon the Table of the House.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked if the Indian Government were consulted beforehand.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Certainly.

June 18*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE TREASURY CHEST FUND.

Mr. COHEN asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he could state in what manner it was proposed to leave in the hands of the Treasury chest officers at the various stations abroad the funds necessary as a working capital for effecting payments abroad for which the Treasury chest was by statute destined, if the funds of the Treasury chest were temporarily appropriated to defray the cost of the expedition to Egypt, seeing that on March 31, 1895, the sum of £378,095 19s. 11d. was in the hands of Her Majesty's Paymaster-General, and £210,063 1s. in the hands of the Treasury chest officer at 15 colonial stations, and that the total amount of the Treasury chest fund was limited to £700,000.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not see any difficulty in this matter. The proposed advances from the Treasury chest are for the extraordinary expenditure of the Indian garrison at Suakin. It appears from the return from which the hon. member quotes that the statutory *maximum* of £700,000 for the aggregate of cash balances had not been reached at the date given; but, even so, the amount standing to the credit of the Paymaster-General was £378,000.

THE SIAM AGREEMENT.

East India (Siam and the Upper Mekong).—Address for "Return of Letter from the Government of India to the Secretary of State, dated the 6th day of May, 1896, on the subject of the Agreement with France respecting Siam and the Upper Mekong." (Mr. MACLEAN.)

June 19*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STEEL SLEEPERS FOR INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. BRIGG asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any information as to the cause of the reported failure of rolled steel sleepers in use on the Indian State railways, or the other public railways in that country; and, if correct, whether such failure was confined to any particular district.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: So far as my information goes, there are only three cases in which the employment of steel sleepers for Indian railways has given unsatisfactory results, and as regards two of these, the cause is said to be the saline quality of the earth in which they are laid. In the third case the deterioration is attributed to some defects in the ballast and method of laying.

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN INDIA.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the scheme promulgated by the Government of India in 1893 for encouraging the construction of railways in India by private enterprise, and with rupee capital, had led to a large number of applications being made for concessions for the building of railways:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table a Return showing the terms promulgated by the Government of India in 1893 and subsequently, on which such concessions were to be applied for; the number of applications of all kinds for such concessions received from 1893 up to the present date, showing the mileage and other particulars contained in such applications; and the number of concessions granted, with particulars relating thereto.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A considerable number of applications have been received at the India Office, and it is believed that others have been sent direct to the Government of India. I will make further enquiry on this subject, and when the enquiry is complete I will lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the nature suggested.

June 22*nd*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE JHALAWAR CASE.

East India (Mahárájá Rana of Jhalawar).—Return (presented 19th June) to be printed (No. 245.)

June 23*rd*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

POPPY CULTIVATION IN INDIA.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India if he could state what was the quantity of land which had been under poppy cultivation this year in the Behar and Benares Agencies respectively, as compared with the years 1893-4 and 1894-5.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The total acreage under opium cultivation in the Behar and Benares agencies during the last three seasons, deducting that in which the crop was a failure, was as follows: 1893-94, 458,181; 1894-95, 513,804; 1895-96, 519,072.

I am unable for purposes of comparison, to give the quantities in the Behar and Benares agencies separately.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the total number of Indian troops now at Suakin was as stated in a telegram on Friday, 4,841:

What was the cause of this large increase in the force from the number named by him on 2nd June:

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

And, what would be the estimated charge per month for ordinary expenses of the total Indian force now at Suakin or under orders to go there.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: There has been no increase in the number of Indian Troops at Suakin as given in my reply to the hon. member on the 2nd June. In addition to these there are a considerable number of camp followers, but even if these are included, the total would fall short of 4,841.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Will the number to be charged for to the Indian Government be the number which the noble Lord mentioned on June 2nd?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes, that will be the total number charged for.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

INDIAN TROOPS IN THE SUDAN.

In the course of a statement made with reference to the course of business during the Session.

Mr. Balfour said that he held himself at liberty to take a day for the discussion of the Indian troops question.

June 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE UNCOVENANTED SERVICES.

Mr. MACNEILL asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Resolution of the Government of India, dated 22nd June, 1895, altered the leave rules of Indian Uncovenanted Civil Servants, in accordance with the ruling of the Secretary of State's Despatch No. 188, dated 21st September, 1893, on a review of the whole subject:

Whether the concessions to those officers, all of which were granted in the first paragraph of the Resolution could only be enjoyed by any officer on condition of his consenting to come under the serious disabilities imposed in a subsequent paragraph:

Whether he was aware that in many cases the disabilities authorised in the paragraph more than neutralised the concessions of the first paragraph, and actually diminished the amount of furlough to which the uncovenanted officers concerned were formerly entitled:

Whether he could state the grounds on which these disabilities were imposed:

And, whether he would move the Government of India to amend the rules so as to afford the relief recommended by the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1890.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The answer to the first question is in the affirmative.

To the second and third, it is possible that some of the officers would not benefit by accepting the new concession.

To the fourth, no new disabilties have been imposed. As stated in my reply to the hon. member for the Faversham Division on the 21st May, the rules must be accepted as a whole.

To the fifth, very considerable relief has been given to the "uncovenanted" servants since 1890 in the matter of leave. I cannot admit that the recommendations of the Select Committee have not had justice done to them.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 6. AUGUST, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from June 29th to July 24th.

Imperial Parliament.

June 29th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

MUSSULMAN LAW IN INDIA.

Lord STANLEY OF ALDERLEY rose to ask whether the Secretara of State for India was aware of the alarm prevailing among the Mussulman subjects of her Majesty in India, owing to a recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Abdul Faiz Mahomed Ishak and others *versus* Russomoy Dhar Chowdry and others, the effect of which was to abrogate an important branch of the Mussulman law—namely, that relating to family vakfs, or the law relating to the creation of benefactions for the endower's family, with the reversion for the general poor; whether it was not the fact that the full enjoyment of their law and religious usages and institutions, so far as they did not conflict with any statutory enactment, has been guaranteed to the Indian Mussulmans by her Majesty's Proclamation. The law in question related to one of their most cherished institutions, upon which depended the prosperity of their principal families, which had rendered important services to the State in times of danger; whether it was not the fact that numerous memorials had been presented to the Indian Government against this judicial decision; and whether they have not prayed for a declaratory Act declaring the validity of the law which had been held to be invalid; and what steps the Government propose to take to redress the wrongs inflicted by this decision of the Privy Council. The noble lord said that he regretted having to differ from the opinions of the noble lord (Lord Hobhouse), and he regretted having been told by him that he thought this question of vakfs was dead, since it was as lively as ever, and the noble lord might have remembered that "the evil that men do lives after them." The notice on the Minutes had been prepared about last July, at which time memorials against the Privy Council judgment had been sent in to the Indian Government. This notice had been put on the Minutes in August and September last, so that there had been ample time for obtaining some of these memorials. He would, perhaps, be told that no memorials had been received at the India Office. This was most likely, if they had not been asked for, and after the notice last September, they ought to have been asked for; and the Indian Office ought to be ready with an answer to the question as to these memorials. The Mussulmans, however, were not the only persons aggrieved by the attitude recently taken by the Indian Administration, with regard to family settlements. The Hindus also had reason to complain of a decision in what was called the Tazore case. He had always felt the highest respect for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and he voted against his inclination and against a Resolution moved in 1872 by the late Earl Stanhope, and supported by the noble Marquess now at the head of the Government, on the occasion of the appointment of the late Sir Robert Collier to a seat on that Bench, because of the high opinion that was entertained at the time of the judicial capacity of that learned gentleman. He did not remember ever having read or heard of anything to diminish the judicial reputation of Sir Robert Collier during all the time that he sat in the Privy Council. During that debate in 1872 the noble marquess (the Prime Minister) had blamed the parsimony of Mr. Gladstone's Government, which had given too low a salary for the Privy Council Judgships, and if the salaries then fixed were still insufficient, he hoped her Majesty's Government would make them such as to secure a first-rate man for the next appointment to the Judicial Committee. He could not help thinking that the decision of the Privy Council, to which he was now calling attention, was likely to jeopardise the reputation of the Judicial Committee. Some decisions might err from the judges not being sufficiently informed on the subject before them, but in this case the decision quoted several very good authorities, but only for the purpose of disregarding them. Syed Amir Aly was an authority before he became a High Court judge at Calcutta. The judgment quoted from him frequently, and its reasons for differing with him were, to say the least, extraordinary. The judgment said: "The opinion of that learned Muhammadan lawyer is founded, as their lordships understand it, upon texts of an abstract character, and upon precedents very imperfectly stated. For instance, he quotes a precept of the Prophet Muhammed himself, to the effect that 'A pious offering to one's family to provide against their getting into want is more pious than giving alms to beggars.'" Further on the judgment said: "These precepts may be excellent in their proper application. They may, for ought their lordships know, have had their effect in moulding the law and practice of vakf as the learned judge says they have." This last sentence ought to have run as follows: "These precepts, as their lordships very well knew, had moulded the law and practice of vakf." This point, as to which the Court professed ignorance, was proved by language. The judgment used the word "Muhammadan" instead of "Mussulman" as to communities. He did not complain of this, since it was an ordinary English phrase; but, as a matter of fact, the adjective "Muhammadan" was never used in any Mussulman country or language except with reference to and to describe the law founded by the Prophet, which was named "Sheriat i Muhammadiyeh," so that Muhammadan law was correct, and a Muhammadan community an incorrect expression. Besides the precepts quoted by Syed Amir Aly, other sayings of the Prophet showed that he recommended charity to the family and dependents of a man in preference to more distant poor. Abu Hurairah said a man came to his Highness (to ask about alms and charity) and said, "I have got one dinar," he said, "expend it upon your-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

self"; the man said, "I have got another dinar," the Prophet said, "expend that upon your children." The man said "I have got another dinar." He said, "expend that upon your relations, your women, father and mother." He said, "I have got another dinar." The Prophet said, "expend that upon your servants." The man said, "I have got another dinar." He said, "you know best the condition of the person most worthy of it, and whoever you know to be so give it." Mishcat ul Musabih. Calcutta, 1809. Vol. I., p. 455). This judgment of the Judicial Committee appeared to have gone wrong, because it failed to be distinguised between gifts and vakfs. Gifts in perpetuity, it said were forbidden by Mussulman law: this is true; but the essence of vakf was its perpetuity. The judgment quoted an opinion of Mr. Justice Farran which showed this: That judge had described a settlement as "a perpetuity of the worst kind which would be invalid on that ground unless it can be supported as an okfnameh." The Privy Council judgment was very near arriving at a correct interpretation and decision when it declared:—"Whether it is to be taken that the very same dispositions, which are illegal when made by ordinary words or gift, become legal if only the settler says that they are made as vakf, in the name of God, or for the sake of the poor. To these questions no answer was given or attempted, nor can their lordships see any." They ought to have seen the answer for the judgment mentioned in the law book "Hidaye." This book was translated and published by order of the Bengal Government in 1791, and a new edition of it was published in 1870. This authority said (p. 234);—"An appropriation (or vakf) is not complete according to Hanifa, unless the appropriation) destine its ultimate application to objects not liable to become extinct; as when for instance a man destines its application ultimately to the use of the poor (by saying I appropriate this to such a person, and after him to the poor), because these never become extinct." So that when the judgment said, "Their lordships agree that the poor have been put into this settlement merely to give it a colour of piety, and so to legalise arrangements meant to serve for the aggrandisement of a family," their lordships appeared to have been ignorant of what was laid down in a law-book that was one of the best known in India, and to have imputed to the settlers as a colourable regard for the poor what was in fact a legal technicality. Whatever fault might be found with this judgment, the merit of great candour must be conceded to it. It stated that this Board in Assun Ullah's case adopted the view of Mr. Justice Kemp to the effect that provision for the family out of the grantor's property might be consistent with the gift of it as vakf. It also cited the judicial opinion of Mr. Justice Amir Aly in Bikani Min's case, a dictum of Sir Raymond West in the Bombay High Court, and a decision of Mr. Justice Farran in the same Court—all these contrary to this judgment. Mention had often been made of those who were *Plus Royalistes que le Roi*. In this case the India Office appeared to pose as a more strenuous supporter of Mussulman law than the Indian Mussulmans or the Turks of Constantinople, by denying the legality of such vakfs. The last time he was at Constantinople, which was six or seven years ago, before these cases had arisen in India, he had heard of similar vakfs, or family appropriations in Constantinople, and a few days ago he met a Turkish diplomatic agent who had confirmed the existence of many such vakfs at Constantinople. Some writers said that Mussulman law was not sufficiently elastic, and that it was only suited to primitive communities. The Indian Administration and the Privy Council Judges were in these cases endeavouring to deprive that law of the elasticity it did possess; and with regard to the latter accusation, all the practices of the Liverpool Produce Exchange were forbidden in Mishcat al Musabih. He had lately read a French historian's comment on judicial decisions during the reigns of the Stuarts, and their base subservience to the Government. He thought that a future historian reading the Privy Council judgment and the communication he had received from the India Office would infer similar pliancy on this occasion. For his own part he would be more inclined to impute obstinacy than pliancy to the noble lord who had delivered the judgment. But whether the legal or executive officials in India were at fault in this matter, it would be easy to remedy it, if the Secretary of State would order a Declaratory Act to be passed in the sense petitioned for in some of the memorials. He thought he had shown that the judgment of the Judicial Committee was not in accordance with Mussulman law, neither was it in accordance with Christian law. When their lordships so lightly dismissed the precepts quoted by Mr. Justice Amir Aly, they might have remembered that there was not much difference between them and the eighth verse of the fifth chapter of the 1st Epistle of Paul to Timothy. "But if any provide not for his own and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." Perhaps, as St. Paul lived 600 years earlier, the Privy Council judges who thought the precepts of the Prophet too old, would think still less of St. Paul's precept. A case had, however, been decided this year in one of her Majesty's Law Courts in London, by which a will leaving some thirteen thousand pounds to the poor had been upset. It was true that this was due to a technicality, but the satisfaction with the decision had been general, because the testator had left five relations unprovided for, one of whom was in the workhouse, and two others on the verge of it. He now came to the last two paragraphs of the Notice—questions addressed to the Under Secretary for India, as to what steps the Government of India would take. A correspondence had been going on in the *Moslem Chronicle* of Calcutta showing the interest taken in this question. A pleader, Mehmed Mustafa Khan, had written a letter, dated May 11th, from the Vakil's Library, High Court, in the *Chronicle* of May 23rd last. This letter repudiated the views urged in another letter of Mr. Iradut Ullah in the *Chronicle* of May 9th. After pointing out that for a Mussulman to propose to repeal divine law by human legislation would be apostacy, he ended his letter in the following words, and he entreated the noble earl to give his attention to them: "The vakf question, however, stands on a different footing, and its administration by our Courts has, to a great extent, certainly been unsatisfactory. Even here our Courts profess to expound the Muhammadan law, but we say 'No,' this is not our law, and we have now appealed to the Government to put our Courts right by legislation. But the difference in the two legislations proposed is that, while in the vakf question we want an Act confirming the Muhammadan law disturbed by our Courts, Mr. Iradut Ullah wants an Act disturbing Muhammadan law heretofore rightly administered." These few words summed up the whole question. It would be preposterous if the answer were that the India Office could not interfere, after the Secretary of State had interfered with the Government of India in an unprecedented manner by a Mandate to alter the cotton duties, in order to redeem the electioneering pledges which he had incautiously given to Lancashire.

The Earl of ONSLOW: It is the fact that full enjoyment of their law and religious usages and institutions has been guaranteed to the Mussulman population of India by her Majesty's Proclamation; but the case to which the noble lord has called attention was decided by the Privy Council strictly in accordance with the Mussulman law. It was a case in which a remainder to the poor was inserted merely for the purpose of perpetuating a bequest to the family of a testator, and in accordance with the Mussulman law it was held by the Privy Council not to be valid. The noble lord asks whether it is not the fact that numerous memorials have been presented against this decision. The India Office is not aware that any memorials have been presented, and it is quite certain that they were not numerous. It may be that the parties in this case may have presented a memorial, but no others are known of. The Government of India does not propose to take any steps to redress the wrongs which the noble lord imagines to have been inflicted by the decision, and if any representation is made on the subject it should be to the local government, who will be able to introduce legislation.

The LORD CHANCELLOR: My lords, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without entering a protest against the precedent set by the noble lord. It is quite within his right, if he thinks proper, to ask her Majesty's Government whether they mean to alter the law; but to argue a judgment of the Privy Council —a matter over which I may point out, your lordships have no jurisdiction at all—and to use such language as the noble lord has thought it right to use—namely, that the judges have altered the law, and that wrongs have been inflicted by their decision—appears to me neither a decorous treatment of the highest legal tribunal of the land nor a very desirable precedent to set; and, further, it is not calculated, I think, to add to the dignity and impressions which the judgments of the Privy Council make in those places where observations such as those of the noble lord are likely to do more mischief than good. (Hear, hear.) The noble lord must assume that this is the law,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

because when once a decision has been given by the highest Court of Appeal it becomes the law of the land. Therefore, the noble lord's course should be to alter the law and not to make observations on the character of a judgment which may do no little harm in the country affected. (Hear, hear.) I want to say this, further, that when the noble lord examines the judgment and comments upon it and reasons with it he is in this difficulty. I am making this protest because I was not a party to this judgment. If I had been I should have refused to have said a word, and I do not suppose that any one of the learned judges sitting in this House who were parties to that judgment would condescend to argue with the noble lord whether their judgment was right or wrong after they had once delivered it. (Hear, hear.) They would tell the noble lord to look at the judgment and read it and—may I add?—understand it—(laughter and cheers)—before he comments upon it.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY said he understood the noble and learned lord to say that the Privy Council made the law. For that reason it was justifiable to ask that her Majesty's Government should alter it.

INDIAN DESPATCHES.

Lord REAY asked the Under-Secretary of State for India whether he would lay on the Table of the House a return of opinions and reasons entered in the minutes of the proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council with reference to the despatch of April 2, 1896, to the Government of India, leaving to their operation Acts 2 and 3 of 1896, on the subject of the Indian Tariff Act and the cotton duties; a similar return with reference to the expenses of troops to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops; and the despatches from the Government of India on the liability of India to defray the cost.

The Earl of ONSLOW said that there would be no objection to laying the first two papers to which the question of the noble lord referred upon the Table if he would move for them. The third paper would be presented to both Houses in due course by command, and therefore there was no necessity for the noble lord to move for its production.

Lord REAY moved that the first two papers should be laid upon the Table.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Loans raised in India), Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended on the 31st March, 1896, etc., [by Act]; to be printed [No 257].

East India (Kafiristan)—Return [presented 26th June] to be printed. [No. 262.]

East India (Siam and the Upper Mekong),—Return [presented 26th June] to be printed. [No. 263.]

INDIAN TROOPS AND MASHONALAND.

Sir ELLIS ASHMEAD-BARTLETT asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether her Majesty's Government would, in view of the critical position of British Colonists in Mashonaland, send a force of her Majesty's Indian Army to their relief *viâ* Beira.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: If more troops are required for the suppression of the rebellion I am advised that it will be undesirable to employ Indian regiments, as this would be accepted by the natives as a confession of weakness on the part of the whites. General Goodenough and Sir F. Carrington have been informed that her Majesty's Government are prepared to send any reinforcements which they may consider necessary, but they agree that no more troops are required at present. (Hear, hear.) Her Majesty's Government however, propose to keep the Cape garrison at its full strength, and will supply the places of any troops which have been or may be moved to the front. With this object a battalion of the King's Royal Rifles has been ordered to the Cape from Malta. (Hear, hear.)

June 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

East India (Suakin Expedition). Copy presented of Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State in Council regarding the incidence of the cost of Indian troops when employed out of India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

"LAPSE AND ESCHEAT."

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS asked the Secretary of State for India whether there was any, and, if so, what difference between the law as to lapse and escheat in British India and Native India:

What were the conditions required to constitute respectively a lapse or escheat in India, such as to vest the territory so lapsing or escheating in the British Government:

And, whether, in the event of any of the present ruling Princes and Chiefs in India dying without male issue, the law of lapse and escheat as prevailing in India or this country would apply.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The law as to lapse and escheat in British India rests upon the law administered by the British Courts of Judicature established by legislative enactment. The law in the Native States depends upon the Native State law and the will of its Prince or Chief, and it varies in almost every State. As regards the second and third questions, to answer them would require a legal treatise on the law of escheat, and which I am quite unable to deliver.

LAPSED ESTATES IN INDIA.

Mr. HERBERT LEWIS asked the Secretary of State for India how soon he expected to receive the information, which he had requested the Government of India to furnish, with reference to the Return relating to lapsed estates in India, moved on the 19th instant.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: My reference to the Government of India on the subject of the notice put down by the hon. member on the 18th June went by last week's mail, but I do not expect to receive a reply before the end of August.

THE INDIAN MAILS.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster-General, whether the invitations for tenders for the new contracts respecting the conveyance of the Indian and Australian mails had been or would shortly be published; and whether he would state the new conditions as to time, speed required, etc.:

Whether he was aware that, owing to the depreciation of the rupee, large numbers of officers serving in India were either unable to visit England, or found it necessary to travel second class, in company with the soldiers from the ranks:

Whether he was aware that the French Government had made special arrangements with the Messageries Maritimes Company for a reduction in the fares of French officers serving in the French Colonies:

And, whether he would take steps for the inclusion in the new contracts for the conveyance of mails to India and the East of provisions for the transport of officers on active service at reduced fares.

Mr. HANBURY: As stated in this House in reply to a question asked on April 17th by the hon. member for Glasgow (Blackfriars), advertisements for tenders for new contracts for the Indian and Australian mail services were published on and after April 8th last. Among others, tenders have been invited for the conveyance of the mails between Brindisi or some other European port and Bombay in 322 hours, 312 hours, or 302 hours; and between Brindisi, Naples, or some other port in Europe and Adelaide *via* Colombo and Albany or Fremantle in 720 hours or 672 hours—the Australian service to be performed by steamers starting from and returning to this country, but not at fixed speed. The Postmaster-General is not aware that, owing to the depreciation of the rupee, large numbers of officers serving in India are either unable to visit England or find it necessary to travel second class in company with the soldiers from the ranks. He understands that arrangements have been made between the French Government and the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Messageries Maritimes Company for a reduction in the fares of French officers serving in French colonies. He has no intention of initiating any provision such as that suggested by the hon. member with the view, as it would seem, of affording pecuniary relief to officers in India at the expense of the Post Office revenue.

THE AFRICAN WILD ELEPHANT.

Mr. BRYCE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the India Office had been called to the desirability of preventing the extinction of the African wild elephant in Somaliland by the establishment of a reserve or sanctuary for those animals within the British Somaliland Protectorate:

Whether he had received a memorial on the subject from Mr. Edward N. Buxton, who lately visited Somaliland and examined the question:

And, whether it was intended to take steps for the prevention of the slaughter of elephants in the district indicated, having regard to the probability that in default of such steps the wild elephants now to be found in the Somaliland Protectorate would very soon be either driven out or extirpated.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The answer to the right hon. member's first and second questions is in the affirmative. I have invited an expression of the opinion of the Government of Bombay as to any modification that may be required in the rules in order to prevent the extermination of wild elephants; and upon the receipt of their reply I shall be glad to consider what steps it may be advisable to take to secure this object.

THE INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the despatch from the Government of India, received last week, and any reply made thereto by the India Office, would be laid upon the Table of the House in time to be considered by members before the debate on the pay of the Indian troops sent to Suakin took place.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I will lay papers to-day on the Table of the House relating to the despatch of Indian troops in 1885 to Suakin, together with telegrams and despatches relating to the present expedition, and I hope that they will be distributed on Thursday next.

July 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BOMBAY SMALL CAUSE COURT.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received a memorial from the Bombay Presidency Association against the appointment of Mr. C. N. Macleod, barrister-at-law, to be second judge of the Bombay Small Cause Court, and what his decision on that memorial had been:

Whether, under the Secretary of State's despatch of 12th September, 1889, a barrister, in order to hold that post, must be of 10 year's standing, and possess a thorough knowledge of the vernacular languages; and, whether Mr. Macleod possessed those qualifications:

Whether the Secretary of State had issued any unpublished instructions modifying the Despatch of September, 1889; and, if so, whether he would lay them upon the Table of the House:

Whether the appointment of Mr. Macleod involved the supersession of Mr. Cursetjee, the third judge, a barrister of 26 years' standing, who had served as a judge for 22 years, and had acted as first judge of the Court on three occasions:

And, whether, seeing that the fourth and fifth judges, who were also superseded, were officers of experience and long standing, the Secretary of State would veto the appointment of Mr. Macleod.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received no memorial against the appointment of Mr. Macleod to the Bombay Small Cause Court. It was decided by the Secretary of State in Council, in compliance with the prayer of a memorial which had the support of the Government of India and of the Government of Bombay, that the restrictions laid down for the Provincial Service in the Despatch of 12th September, 1889, should not apply to this office. That decision was conveyed in a despatch dated August 25th, 1892; and I shall be ready to lay the Correspondence on the Table if the hon. member will move for it. The appointment is by law within the discretion of the Government of Bombay; and I cannot admit that the fact of certain gentlemen having already served as judges gives them a claim in preference to any other person who, in the opinion of that Government, may possess higher qualifications.

THE INDIAN FRONTIER.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India if Haidari, Tach, and Sarwakai, which were not part of India when c. 21 and 22 Vic. of 1858 became law, were now not beyond the external frontier of her Majesty's Indian possessions, and when and how were those frontiers so extended as to include those places.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I would invite the attention of the hon. baronet, to the answer given by me on the 4th of June which answers his first question; as to how the places mentioned have become formally included within the external frontiers of her Majesty's Indian possessions, I must refer him to the Kabul Convention recently published.

July 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN RAILWAYS: REPORT FOR 1895-6.

East India (Railways). Copy presented of Administration Report for 1895-6 by Col. T. Gracey, R.E., Director General of Railways in India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.
VOTING IN THE INDIA COUNCIL.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether the decision conveyed in his despatch to the Government of India of 30th June, by which the ordinary expenses of the Indian troops at Suakin were to be borne by the Indian Exchequer, obtained the unanimous support of the Secretary of State's Council; and, if not, what were the numbers and the names of those members of his Council who were opposed to that decision.

Mr. CURZON (for Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): Seven members of the Council of India, irrespectively of the Secretary of State, voted in favour of the decision to which the hon. member refers, and four members, namely, Sir Donald Stewart, Sir James Peile, Mr. Hardie, and Mr. Le Marchant, were opposed to it.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Replying to a question of Sir W. HARCOURT as to the order of business next week,

Mr. BALFOUR said, We propose to take the resolutions with respect to the employment of Indian troops in the Sudan on Monday.

SALARIES OF BRITISH RESIDENTS IN INDIA.

Major JAMESON asked the Secretary of State for India if there was any objection to granting the Return on to-day's Paper relating to the salaries of British residents in India.

Mr. GEORGE CURZON (for Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): The Secretary of State for India will refer to the Government of India, and, if they see no objection to the granting of this return, will communicate with the hon. member in order that he may move for it. It is assumed that, when he speaks of heads of departments, the hon. member refers to officers lent to Native States to act as heads of department under the Native administration.

July 6th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY said he wished to put a question to the noble earl the Under Secretary for India. A return had

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

been laid before the House of the correspondence with the Government of India on the subject of the payment of the Indian troops which had been sent to Suakin, but the papers had not been circulated among the members of their lordships' House. In view of the importance of the subject and the action being taken on the matter in the other House, the point was an important one, and he thought some explanation should be given why the paper had not been circulated. He was aware, of course, that the noble earl the Under Secretary was not responsible for the omission, but it was obvious that an important paper of this kind, upon which, no doubt, a motion would be founded in the House, should be circulated, and he wished to know why it had not been done. He also wished to ask the noble earl whether he had any objection to lay before the House the despatch or despatches from the Government of India in regard to the recent treaty with France in respect to Siam, and also the correspondence between the Amír of Afghanistan and the inhabitants of Kafiristan.

The EARL OF ONSLOW said he shared the surprise of the noble earl that the paper referred to, which was of great importance in view of the debate which was to take place in the other House on the matter, had not been circulated. On enquiry he had been informed that the procedure in reference to papers to be laid on the Table of that House was governed by what took place in the other House, and he had learned with some surprise that the members of the House of Commons had not received copies of the paper either. (Laughter.) The papers could, of course, be obtained at the Printed Paper Office; but, in view of the importance of the subject and the debate that would be raised upon it, he would take the necessary steps to see that the papers were circulated among their lordships. With respect to the other papers referred to, they had been presented by the House of Commons, and if the noble earl would move for them in that House they should be printed and circulated.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY said it was very desirable that papers of an important character should be circulated as soon as possible, not only on account of the information they contained, but in order to call the attention of their lordships to the fact that such papers had been laid on the Table. He moved formally for the production of the papers to which he had referred.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BURMESE RAILWAYS.

Mr. WOLFF asked the Secretary of State for India whet he a syndicate was about to purchase the Burmese railways for the sum of £6,000,000; and, if so, whether the House would have an opportunity of discussing the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON; Proposals after consultation with the Government of India have been made, and are now under consideration, not for purchasing, but for taking over the working and extension of the Burma Railways by a company to be formed for the purpose: I am in hopes that a decision may be speedily arrived at. Transactions of this kind in connection with Indian Railways are not infrequent; but it is not usual to submit them for discussion in Parliament and I see no reason why in the present instance we should depart from the ordinary practice.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

ORDINARY EXPENSES CHARGED UPON INDIA.

"A MASTERPIECE OF MELANCHOLY MEANNESS."

IMPORTANT DEBATE.

THE GOVERNMENT'S MAJORITY REDUCED.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON moved: "That Her Majesty having directed a military expedition of her native forces charged upon the revenues of India to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops, this House consents that the ordinary pay of any troops so despatched, as well as the ordinary charges of any vessels belonging to the Government of India that may be employed in this expedition, which would have been charge- upon the resources of India if such troops or vessels had red mained in that country or seas adjacent, shall continue to be so chargeable: provided that if it shall become necessary to replace the troops or vessels so withdrawn by other vessels or native forces, then the expense of raising, maintaining, and providing such vessels and forces shall, in so far as may not be otherwise provided, be repaid out of any moneys which may be provided by Parliament for the purposes of the said expedition." The noble lord said: I rise to make the motion which has been for some days on the Notice Paper of the House. Every member who has read it will see that it divides itself into two parts. The first part suggests that the ordinary pay connected with the troops despatched to Suakin should for a certain time be apportioned to Indian revenues; and the second part of the Resolution proposes that any extra charge of any kind or sort arising either directly or indirectly from the employment of these troops should be charged on the Imperial revenue. Roughly speaking, the two propositions which this Resolution contains are, first, that India shall not make money by participation in an enterprise in which she has a common interest with this country. But, on the other hand, she should not be asked to spend any money because she is interested in common with this country in such enterprise. These two propositions taken together seem incontestably just, always provided that one can show that India has a special interest in the object of the expedition to which these troops may be attached. Perhaps I may explain why it is necessary to move this Resolution. It is to comply with the 55th section of the Government of India Act of 1858, which relates to the expenditure connected with the employment of troops outside the external frontiers of India. During the past few years a number of expeditions have been sent from India for various purposes, and perhaps it will interest the House if I give these expeditions in chronological order. The first occasion on which troops were employed outside the external frontiers of India after the Government of India had been transferred to the Crown was in 1859, in connexion with the third China War. In 1867 a large expedition was sent to Abyssinia from India: in 1875 a small expedition was sent from India to Perak to put down certain disturbances there; in 1878 a considerable number of Indian troops were sent from India to Malta. In the same year a war occurred in Afghanistan which necessitated the employment of a considerable number of Indian troops outside the external frontiers of India. In 1882 an expedition was sent to Egypt, and another expedition was sent to the Sudan in 1885, and this year two expeditions left India, one for Mombasa and the other for Suakin. These expeditions naturally classify themselves into certain categories in accordance with the financial arrangements connected with each. First come those expeditions in which no charge whatever was made either in connection with the ordinary pay or extraordinary expenditure on the revenues of of India. The expeditions in which this has occurred are the third China War; the movement of troops to Malta, and recently the movement of troops from Bombay to Mombasa. In no instance where the whole of the expenditure has been borne by any funds other than the revenues of India has any Resolution been moved in Parliament. In the second category comes those expeditions in which the ordinary charge is placed upon India and the extra expense placed upon other sources, and these comprised the Abyssinian War of 1867, the expedition to Perak in 1875, the Sudan expedition of 1885, and the expedition which left this year. In all these cases, with the single exception of Perak, a Resolution was moved in the House of Commons. Last come the cases in which not only the ordinary expenditure, but all expenditure above that, was placed upon the revenues of India. Two expeditions only come under this class—namely, the second Afghan War, and the expedition sent to Egypt in 1882 by the right hon. gentleman opposite. In both of these cases a certain contribution was eventually made from Imperial funds, but on each occasion the greater part of the extra-ordinary charges was placed upon Indian revenues. The practice, therefore, has been uniform. No Resolution has been moved unless it was intended that certain charges should ultimately be paid out of Indian revenues. This section is not one, as has been stated, to restrain the prerogatives of the Crown or the Executive in moving troops from one part of the empire to the other, but only for the purpose of safeguarding the Indian revenue. All the lawyers who have been consulted

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

are unanimous in so interpreting it. There is, it is true, a certain *obiter dictum* by a Secretary of State for India which is opposed to that view. I have the highest regard for the opinion of a Secretary of State, but the views of a Secretary of State do not necessarily constitute law. (Laughter.) The only doubt, as far as I know, ever entertained by lawyers concerning the construction of the section is whether, from its peculiar phraseology, it is necessary to move a Resolution where the ordinary pay only was to be defrayed by Indian revenue. A consensus of opinion in recent years is in the affirmative, but a contrary opinion prevailed some time back. The financial result of the Resolution will be that the ordinary pay and allowances of the Indian troops, amounting to about £5,000 a month, will be borne by Indian revenues. It is true that the Council of India have restricted that charge to the close of the present year. It is, I think, very likely, but, if the Indian troops are in Egypt at that time, the Council will consider itself perfectly free to act as they may think fit. The extraordinary expenses, independently of any expenditure for local transport from Suakin will be about £140,000, which will be found from the treasury chest.

Mr. LEONARD COURTNEY: How long will that last for?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: That is for the same time. Two arguments have been advanced against this arrangement. The first is that there is a risk in taking such a number of troops from the Indian establishment, and the second is that the financial charge on the Indian revenue is not a fair one. Let us consider each of these. As to the first, I quite agree that the greatest caution is necessary to prevent India being drawn upon to meet any of the military emergencies that may occur in Africa. Imperial interests are rapidly spreading in that continent, and there is no doubt that from time to time demands will be made for troops to maintain law and order, and to the Indian Government and the Indian army will the Imperial Government look as extraordinarily well suited for this purpose. When we take into account the numbers of men in past and in the present expeditions, we see that the present expedition involves a much smaller abstraction of force, for a temporary period, from the military strength of India than has been involved in former expeditions of recent years. The total forces in India now number 75,000 Europeans and about 140,000 natives. At the dates of previous expeditions the numbers were considerably less—about 60,000 Europeans and 120,000 natives. The expedition to Abyssinia consisted of 14,000 men, 10,000 natives and 4,000 Europeans; they were all taken from the Indian establishment. Considering that that expedition left India within ten years of the Mutiny, I must say it does seem to me to have been a somewhat dangerous weakening of the military establishment in India. It was in that sense that the present Prime Minister, speaking in the other House, laid down the maxim that India could not be looked upon as a reservoir from which this country could draw an unlimited number of troops without paying for them. In 1882, when right hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, they sent a considerable expedition from India to Egypt - 6,700 men, of whom 2,000 were Europeans. In 1885, the same Government sent another expedition consisting of 3,200 native troops. The present expedition numbers only 2,500, and to deduct that number from a total army of 210,000 is a very different thing from dedu ting 14,000 from a total force of 180,000. Of course, the risk which a country runs by having a force taken away is increased by the length of time that that force is absent, and therefore the Government will take the precaution to put a limit on the time during which India is to pay the ordinary expenses of the troops.

An HON. MEMBER: That is not in the Resolution.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is not in the Resolution, but it is in the despatch. No Resolution in this House in reference to expenditure is binding upon the India Council. So much for the allegation that we are unduly drawing on the military establishment of India. I turn now to the more serious consideration that this proposal is unjust to the Indian revenue. Any protest of that kind coming from the Indian Government is worthy of the most careful consideration—(cheers)—and the Council at the India Office have given a very exhaustive examination to the arguments and the reasons which have been urged by the Indian Government. Roughly speaking, and stripped of all phraseology, the contention of the Indian Government amounts to this—that since the neutralisation of the Suez Canal India has no special interest in Egypt over and above other parts of the British Empire. I have examined that contention to the best of my ability; I have taken the advice of some very able authorities; and I venture to say that neither from the historical nor from the military point of view can that contention be maintained. India has always had a special interest in Egypt over and above that of other portions of the Empire, and if we were to assent to the present contention of the Government of India—which, after all, is only the *ipse dixit* of the Government of the day—it would be difficult to mention any expedition outside the frontier of India in which India has had any special interest. No one who has watched the development of India can deny that Indian interests in different parts of Asia and Africa are decade by decade increasing. I have always contended, and will always contend, for a fair distribution of the expenditure which will be necessary to defend those external interests; but if the Home Government were to assent to the proposition of the Indian Government it seems to me that, no matter what expedition be necessary in Asia or Africa, it will be impossible ever to ask India to bear any part of the expenditure connected therewith; and as those interests outside India grow and develope, and require protection, the whole cost of that protection will fall upon the taxpayers of this country. But while the Home Government cannot agree to the particular proposal of the Indian Government, I am much in sympathy with the substance of their complaint. Those who have read the despatch of the Indian Government will notice that four-fifths of it do not deal with the proposal now before the House, but they deal with transactions of the past. No one can deny that from time to time charges have been put upon India somewhat in excess of the interests which India has had in former expeditions. (Opposition cheers.) It is the recollection of these transactions that has been in the mind of the Indian Government. The Abyssinian expedition was too heavy a drain on the military establishment. But—and I do not say this for the purpose of annoying right hon. gentlemen opposite—the particular transaction which rankles in the mind of the Indian Government is the action taken in 1882. (Cheers.) That action was of a very summary character. The Government of the day requested the Indian Government to send a large expedition to Egypt to work in accord with the British force; and on July 24th the Home Government telegraphed to the Indian Government that, subject to final decision on any representation the Indian Government desired to make, the Home Government proposed that the Indian revenue should bear all the expenses of the Indian contingent. This was the reply of the Indian Government on the 26th: "We beg unanimously to protest very strongly against the proposal that the Indian revenue shall bear all the expenses of the Indian contingent for service in Egypt." The next day the right hon. gentleman then in office brought down a Resolution to this House which put all the charges on the Indian revenue; and it was the present leader of the Opposition who formally moved that Resolution. In that transaction the Indian Government does seem to me to have been treated with but little consideration. But even in that controversy the Indian Government did not take up the position which has since been assumed by the present occupants of office in India. They did not then object to paying a certain portion of the expenses of the expedition; their objection was that India should pay the whole cost; they pointed out that the precedents of the past were against such a proposal; and they looked with anxiety upon the establishment of so dangerous a principle for the future. Well, the Home Government did, to a certain extent, moderate the Resolution, and a certain contribution was made from the Imperial Exchequer towards meeting a portion of the extraordinary charges of the expedition; but India had to pay 60 per cent. of the extraordinary expenditure. Again, in 1885, the right hon. gentleman placed a Resolution on the Notice Paper of the House, without giving the Indian Government time to have its views laid before Parliament. What is the result of thus, in the past, placing undue obligations upon India on the assumption that the Indian Government has a joint interest with this country in these enterprises? The Indian Government, to save themselves from charges which they consider excessive, now repudiate all common interest in expeditions outside of India.

An HON. MEMBER: No.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I think they do so; in the despatch laid upon the Table of the House they lay it down that they have no special interest in Egypt. ("No!" and some HON.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

MEMBERS: "In the Sudan!") Very well; but in 1882 the Indian Government did admit that they had an interest, because they were willing to pay the ordinary charges, and having had to pay the extraordinary charges laid upon them, they then denied that they had an interest in order to avoid these charges.

An HON. MEMBER: In the Sudan!

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is practically the same thing. Anyhow, my contention is worth consideration; and it is that the result of putting unfair or excessive charges on India in the past is that the Indian Government now repudiate that they have any interest in these expeditions. That is a position which I do not think any responsible minister can accept. Desiring as I do to protect the Indian revenue, and anxious as I am to find a working solution of a difficulty which is constantly cropping up, and which is detrimental to the efficiency of military expeditions from time to time, I venture to suggest that, in the despatch to India, I have laid down a principle which will secure that equity in these matters which the House desires, without rendering us in the future liable to the suggestion which has now come to us from India. I do not know if any hon. members have read our despatch to the Indian Government. If they have they will find three propositions laid down which are for the future to govern the financial arrangements of expeditions of this character. In the first place we say: "It may be laid down that on all occasions when the temporary loan of a military force is urgently required either by Great Britain or by India, such assistance will be promptly given so far as the ability, resources, and situation of either country at the time may permit." There are two military establishments—one in India and one in England—and there is in all ordinary times a certain margin of reserve strength in each establishment, and it is desirable in the common interest of the empire that this double reserve should be available for any expedition it may be necessary suddenly to send out. Therefore, it is desirable that not too onerous obligations should be imposed on the country that wants to borrow the force, because it is necessary that the utilisation of it should be made as expeditiously as possible. In the next place, we lay down: "It would seem to be established that if the object for which such assistance is required is one in which the Government supplying the troops has no special interest beyond that which must be common to all members of the empire, the whole cost of the force, so long as it is required, including both ordinary and extraordinary charges, must be borne by the Government that needs its assistance." That is a principle which I think will recommend itself to the House. (Hear, hear.) But iti s a principle that was not inserted in the despatch merely to give plausibility to our position. It was put in in order that it might be effective; for we have had to decide, not only the question of the apportionment of the expense in connexion with Suakin, but also in connexion with Mombasa, and we came to the conclusion that no part of the expenditure in connexion with the regiment sent on the latter expedition, though sent out of India, should be placed on the Indian revenue. After some discussion and correspondence with the Treasury we have brought the Treasury round to our view, and they have assented to it. Therefore, by our second proposition we have established a precedent which cannot fail to be a great safeguard to the Indian revenue in the future. (Hear, hear.) Our third proposition is: "If the circumstances are such that the Government supplying the troops has a distinct and special interest in the matter at stake, than, although that interest may be less strong than that of the Government requiring assistance, the Government supplying the troops should be content to bear in one form or another a portion of the burden which the operations involve." In this category falls the Suakin expedition. The House will naturally assume that if the Secretary of State in Council, after full deliberation, came to the conclusion that the expedition to Mombasa fell into one category and the expedition to Suakin into another category, there must be in the view of those who made that distinction strong differences in the natures of the two expeditions. I will explain the difference between the two expeditions. There is no doubt that in the neighbourhood of Mombasa and Zanzibar India has a considerable commercial interest—perhaps the largest commercial interest of any portion of the British Empire. Still, we did not feel that that fact was sufficient to justify India being made to bear part of the expenditure to Mombasa. The interest of India, as apart from the other portions of the Empire, did not appear to be of that particular and substantial character which would justify a distinction, and therefore we decided that the whole of the cost of the regiment must be borne by sources other than Indian. But when we came to the expedition to Suakin it seemed to us impossible to pretend that India has not very special interests in Egypt. Let us assume for a moment that India belonged to a foreign country. Would that not constitute an enormous and gigantic diminution of our interest in Egypt? (Cheers.) By merely putting that question it is self-evident that India has, of all parts of the Empire, a special interest in Egypt. (Hear, hear.) I venture to say that there is an unbroken series of precedents in political actions and in military enterprises which support that contention. There has not been an expedition sent by this country to Egypt during the present century in which Indian troops have not participated. In 1801—a time when the Suez Canal was not thought of, when communication between India and England was by the Cape, when England was scarcely the predominant power in India—so vital were the interests of India then in Egypt that a large expedition was sent from India under Baird to co-operate with the English troops in Egypt. Before I came to a decision on this point I was anxious to ascertain the points which decided the apportionment of the expenditure in connexion with that expedition, and on looking into the appendix to the first Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, I found that the East India Company claimed a refund of the whole of the expenditure connected with the expedition, less the ordinary pay of the troops in Egypt. There was a further proviso that the ordinary charges of such of the regiments as went from India to Egypt and did not return thither, of the regiment that was in Egypt but did not proceed to India, and the ordinary charges of levies made in India to replace volunteers from native corps sent to Egypt, should be borne by the Imperial Government. The principle on which the claim was founded was that India should bear the ordinary charges of the troops sent from India and returned thither, but not the ordinary charges of regiments which did not return, and which, therefore, were treated as being struck off the Indian establishment from the date of embarkation, and that she should be paid the cost of any extra troops raised in consequence of their absence and all extraordinary expenses consequent on the expedition. We therefore find that in connexion with an Egyptian expedition as far back as 1801, when India was in the hands of shrewd business men, arrangements were made identical with the arrangements which have been made now. I cannot understand how anyone can pretend that India has no special interest in Egypt. Why, our government in India could not exist if it had not a constant supply of soldiers going out to India from this country year after year to replace other soldiers in India; and it is, in consequence, of vital importance that the shortest route between England and India should be secured. Egypt is the natural resting-place, the natural stepping-stone, between England and India; and if there be stepping-stones across a river which are used by neighbours on both sides of the river, no one will pretend that it is an unfair thing to ask both sides of the river to pay for their repair; and that is practically what we are doing in this case. The House must also recollect that a great change has taken place in the method of dealing with many questions which are purely Eastern and purely Indian in origin and character. Owing to the extension of the influence of European Powers in Africa and Asia, there are many questions which are purely Indian in character and origin which, for convenience sake, are now settled in London instead of in Calcutta; and they are so settled because, being raised in places in the neighbourhood of which certain European authority exists, they have a European aspect as well as an Asiatic aspect, a Western aspect as well as an Eastern aspect. But it must not be assumed that because the *locale* of settlement has, for the purposes of convenience, been changed, that therefore the questions have changed in character, and that they do not still remain Indian and Eastern questions. (Hear, hear.) The Press outside has been good enough to assume that there are great differences of opinion between us and the Indian Government. It is true we differ in details, but the points on which we agree far exceed those upon which we differ. The Government of India have in the first place asked for reciprocity. They say that in the past arrangements have been made beneficial to the Imperial Treasury, but that there has been a

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

disinclination to apply similar principles where they would be beneficial to the Indian Exchequer. In this despatch we have laid down principles which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has admitted shall be reciprocal in character, and we have established an important precedent in the case of Mombasa. (Opposition Hear, hear.) I am glad to get that cheer, because I am the first Secretary of State for India who has sent an expedition from India to Africa the whole cost of which is not to be borne by India. (Cheers.) Therefore, so far as Mombasa is concerned, we are in complete accord with the Indian Government. The Indian Government also wish that their statements and their despatches should be laid in their totality before Parliament. I was not able in the first instance to assent to that proposal because it came during the recess, and I was under an obligation to introduce a Resolution sending the troops to Egypt; but as soon as we came back I willingly assented, and for the first time the statement of the Indian Government has been laid in its entirety before Parliament. Therefore, in three out of four questions we are in complete accord with the Indian Government, and we have been able to comply with their wishes; but in the case of the fourth—for reasons I have mentioned—it is not possible for us to assent to their particular suggestion. I venture to say that if anyone will impartially consider the arrangements which I have laid down in that despatch as regulating the finance connected with expeditions of this character for the future, he will see that they will be advantageous in many ways. These arrangements will secure a unity of military organisation; they will protect Indian finance and establish permanently a working and equitable principle on which the expenditure in connection with these expeditions will in future be regulated. Before I sit down there are two other matters to which I should like to allude. The right hon. member for Montrose is about to follow me. He has been using exceedingly strong language out of doors about this expedition; and he has accused us of embarking on a new and wanton war. (Opposition cheers.) That is really the most astonishing statement I have heard. We are not embarking on a new war; we are trying to finish an old war. (Cheers and Opposition laughter.) The fact is incontestable. Ever since Hicks Pasha was allowed to go to his doom there has been an unceasing, relentless, brutal warfare between the Egyptian Government and the Mahdi and his successors. The one governing factor of it all has been the power of the Mahdi and his successors to inflict injury on Egypt. When strong the Mahdi has invaded Egypt, and if he had his will he would sweep the Egyptian Government into the sea.

An Hon. Member: Why not? (Cheers and laughter.)

Lord G. Hamilton: It is to prevent that that the expedition is at Suakin. The war may have varied in its character, but that which has dominated it has been the power of the Khalifa to inflict harm on Egypt. (Hear, hear.) Everyone knew that if Kassala fell it would give a great increase to the prestige and power of the Khalifa, and all that we have done is to anticipate that danger and, by a forward and offensive movement, to reduce to the smallest dimensions this war, which we have inherited from our predecessors. (Cheers and ironical cheers.) Then the right hon. gentleman has attempted to disparage the operations in which we are engaged by associating them with what he calls "the discreditable disasters in the Sudan in the past." I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman has ever considered what was the origin and cause of those disasters which I admit to have been discreditable. The right hon. gentleman is the great exponent of the policy of abstention and non-interference in Egyptian affairs. Is he aware that all this trouble and difficulty arose from the principles which he professes getting for a short time the upper hand in Egypt? (Cheers.) The history of our troubles and disasters in the Sudan is very remarkable. In 1883 the English Government were masters with regard to Egypt, and the Egyptian Government proposed to send an expedition under Hicks Pasha to reconquer Kordofan. Hicks Pasha knew that he had not the strength for the undertaking, and he implored the Government of the day to help him. (Cheers.) Our representative in Egypt impressed in the clearest and strongest way upon the Government of the day the necessity of doing one of two things—either reinforce Hicks Pacha or prevent him from going on his errand. What was the final policy of the Government? "Earl Granville to Sir E. Malet, June 11, 1883. Your telegram of 5th. Reinforcements for Sudan. Report decision of Egyptian Government as soon as you can, taking care to offer no advice." (Ironical Ministerial cheers.) Later on Sir E. Malet, who was not allowed to advise or interfere or do anything, sends home to the Government a number of despatches saying (13th August, 1883): "I have the honour to enclose copies of three telegrams from General Hicks in regard to affairs in the Sudan, and the numberless difficulties with which he is surrounded." (Hear, hear.) And on August 18th Sir E. Malet wrote to General Hicks: "I congratulate you on your appointment as commander-in-chief and general of division. The act is spontaneous on the part of the Egyptian Government, for, although I am ready to transmit to it telegrams that come from you I am debarred by my instructions from giving advice with regard to action on them. (Cheers.) For a few months that policy of abstention and non-interference, with which the right hon. gentleman is inseparably associated, got the upper hand; and in a very short time after the telegram instructing Sir E. Malet to "take care to give no advice," the British Government had to take the whole affairs into its own hands, and year after year large expeditions were sent out which resulted in nothing but profitless and futile slaughter, and which involved great expenditure to the Egyptian, the English, and the Indian taxpayer. (Cheers.) Therefore, if the right hon. gentleman likes to refer to "the discreditable disasters of the past, he can do so; but they are associated with his principles and not with ours. (Cheers.) The only transaction which can be fairly charged to our policy is not a "discreditable disaster," but the victory of Ferkeh—(cheers)—which is remarkable for the physical and moral regeneration shown by the Egyptian troops. (Cheers.) I say that the right hon. gentleman, although he is one whom we all admire, has never been accepted by his own side as sacred in Egyptian matters; and why is he going to move this amendment? The Front Bench opposite, when in office, moved two motions similar to this, but they were far more drastic and placed far heavier obligations on the Indian Government. I have looked through the division lists, and there is not a single gentleman sitting on the benches opposite who took part in the divisions of 1882 and 1885 who did not vote for the Resolutions similar to that which I am now proposing. (Cheers.) And, therefore, when I explain to the House the modifications and safeguards and concessions with which we have surrounded this Resolution, I cannot believe that right hon. gentlemen opposite will decline to give us that assistance which they, when similarly circumstanced, never hesitated to give themselves. (Cheers.)

Mr. Morley's Amendment.

Mr. John Morley moved to leave out from the word "that" to the end of the question, and to add the words—"it is inexpedient that any portion of the charges of the Indian force that is being dispatched to Africa in aid of Egyptian troops, whether ordinary charges or extraordinary, should be imposed upon the revenues of India." The right hon. gentleman said: The noble lord has remarked that I have out of doors permitted myself to use strong language in connexion with this expedition. I propose, with the permission of the House, to repeat that strong language in the presence of the noble lord. (Cheers.) I do not suppose that an important debate was ever entered upon by a Government under more discouraging circumstances than those of the present Government to-night. (Cheers, and Ministerial cries of "Why?") I am asked why? Because there is not, as far as I can ascertain—and I have taken some trouble to survey the ground—one single organ of the right hon. gentleman opposite which does not condemn the demand which he has now made. (Cheers.) The only cheer of any magnitude which the noble lord secured during his speech was that which followed when he diverged into what I may call complete irrelevance. (Cheers.) The noble lord gave the House a history of the expedition of Hicks Pasha, and he said that that all came from compliance with the principles of which I am the very humble professor, and from following the doctrines with which I am inseparably associated. Yes, sir; but—(pointing to Mr. Chamberlain)—who is sitting next to the noble lord? (Cheers.) The noble lord asks why we did not take part in the divisions in connexion with the expeditions of 1882 and 1885. As far as 1882 goes, it was impossible for me to take part in the division because I was not a member of the House; and in 1885, if I took no part in the division, I did not support the Government of which I was in general an adherent. My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the Colonies and the noble duke the President of the Council—it is they whom the noble lord has been attacking in his recitation of the circumstances of the expeditions of 1882 and 1885. (Cheers.) It is for my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary to defend himself and the Government of which he was a member, and not for me. (Renewed cheers.) The noble lord had prided himself in his remarks about his decision in the case of Mombasa. As I shall presently show, he did establish an admirable precedent in the case of Mombasa; and I move the amendment which stands in my name exactly because the noble lord has departed from that precedent on which he so much prides himself. It will be felt by his own adherents and by those who expected most from his explanation that the noble lord has wandered very wide of the mark, and has scarcely, in one single observation, come to close quarters in the dispute between himself and the Indian Government. (Hear, hear.) The question to-night is not whether this expedition in the Sudan is a good thing or a bad thing in the interests of humanity and civilisation. Nor is it the question whether resort to an Indian force is a good thing or a bad thing in the interests of Egypt or Great Britain. The noble lord says I asserted the other day in the country that the Government have made a new departure. But have they not? We were repeatedly assured by the right hon. gentlemen—by the First Lord of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary to the Colonies—that these operations were to be limited and measured by the financial and military resources of Egypt. (Cheers.) How can it be said that you are limiting the operations by the military resources of Egypt, when you are to-night asking the House of Commons to sanction a charge upon the Indian revenue in order to justify the introduction of an Indian force to eke out the failure of the military forces on the part of Egypt? That may be right, or it may be wrong; but do not pretend that you are not now making a completely new departure. But, again, that is not the question which I wish to discuss to-night. The question before us is this. The Secretary of State in Council of her Majesty's Government takes a certain view of the proper incidence of the charge of this Indian force. The Government of India—which is, after all, the only representative body where the views and interests of the population of India can find a voice and an expression—takes an exactly opposite view. The question is before us as an almost judicial tribunal—the question which of those two authorities is right and which is wrong. This House and the other House are by the Act of 1858, section 55, constituted the arbiters in this dispute. It is to that point and to that great issue to which I wish to call special attention, and on which I wish to base my amendment. The noble lord, like some of those who have gone before him on that Bench, has not appeared to me to give the House a very clear view as to the exact state of the legal and constitutional question. I do not wish to overload what I have to say with a discussion of that legal and constitutional question; but I think I have a right, and it is my duty, to call attention to the extraordinary divergence of language which has been used by gentlemen on the Treasury Bench in connection with this vital and organic section of the Act of 1858. The only gentleman who has been uniformly right in his statement of the law is the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On the 11th of May the Chancellor of the Exchequer told the House that the Government was bound according to the Act of Parliament, where any charge was laid upon the Indian revenue, to come to the House of Commons.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer dissented.

Mr. John Morley: I do not know why the right hon. gentleman should dissent. It is very much to his credit.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer: I had forgotten that I ever said a word about it. (Laughter.)

Mr. J. Morley: They are always forgetting. (Laughter.) Perhaps the First Lord of the Treasury will say he has forgotten that the very next day after the Chancellor of the Exchequer had laid down the law correctly he came and told the House this: "In point of actual law there is no obligation under the statute to have the assent of Parliament, unless some extra charge is thrown upon India. The evidence of precedent is undoubtedly in favour of giving Parliament an opportunity in these cases of discussing whether India should bear extraordinary charges." Surely by this time the right hon. gentleman will have seen that that is a completely inaccurate and misleading statement.

The First Lord of the Treasury: It is perfectly right.

Mr. J. Morley: Does the right hon. gentleman not mean by this to say that there is no obligation to come to this House unless there are extraordinary charges? That is not the case. You are bound to come to the House, and you are coming to the House to-night. The point which the noble lord has argued is that this is the imposition upon the revenues of India, not of an extraordinary, but of an ordinary charge. I am sure the right hon. gentleman will see that his statement was misleading and incorrect. The noble lord the Secretary of State for India has been guilty of some inconsistencies in this matter. The noble lord, in his dispute with the Treasury as to the Mombasa case, caused the following to be written: "In this connexion I am directed to call your attention to the provisions of the Act for the better government of India, 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. 55, to the effect that the revenues of India cannot, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applied to defray the expense of any military operation beyond the frontiers of that country. It appears to Lord George Hamilton that if the ordinary pay and allowances of the force employed on this expedition are defrayed from Indian revenues, it may and will be argued that this section has been contravened, unless the assent of Parliament be previously obtained." The Attorney-General will recollect the debate in 1886, in which there was a duel between himself and Mr. Gladstone as to whether this prior consent before even an ordinary charge was laid upon the Indian revenues was or was not necessary. These issues are raised by the loose language used by gentlemen on that Bench with reference to a constitutional point of the highest importance—a point upon which, for example, Lord Selborne and Lord Cairns carried on in 1878 one of the most remarkable duels in the history of British law. That shows that the noble lord has not carefully informed himself as to the ground on which he is travelling.

Lord George Hamilton: I said the law I believed was perfectly clear except on this particular point as to whether it was absolutely necessary to move a Resolution when the only charges are ordinary charges.

Mr. J. Morley: The point is whether you are bound to move a Resolution before you impose a charge or take steps involving a charge. I am far too prudent, I hope, to venture upon a disputation of this kind. But the noble lord is quite mistaken if he thinks that any interpretation whatever of this important section is one upon which great lawyers have agreed, or do at this moment, as I believe, agree. I would point to the language used by Sir Stafford Northcote in connexion with the Abyssinian expedition when in 1867 he came down to the House and admitted that he and the Government had been guilty, in view of the strict construction of the law, of a contravention of that law, and he apologised to the House for it. Mr. Gladstone, who was then Leader of the Opposition, congratulated him upon admitting his illegality, and he laid down his great *dictum*—which I submit to the hon. gentlemen opposite when they come to consider this matter in the case of Mombasa—that the strictest construction of an Act of Parliament is the only construction that is tolerable within the walls of Parliament. We may depend upon it there is no place where the strict construction of an Act of Parliament—especially a great organic Act like the Act of 1858—ought to be so highly regarded and cherished as in this High Court of Parliament. (Cheers.) The noble lord intimated that he might be found in some conflict with a former Secretary of State for India. The Secretary of State to whom he refers was the present Duke of Devonshire, then Lord Hartington. I think we should be missing an important point in this debate if we did not recall the weighty language used by Lord Hartington in 1882 in making that very motion which the noble lord has said so much about—the language of Lord Hartington upon the conditions under which resort to the Indian troops could be lawfully had. Lord Hartington went much further than the noble lord seems even to dream of. Lord Hartington said that there were two objects in Section 55. The first was to prevent such a contingency as that the Government should carry on military operations by means of troops maintained on Indian establishments and without having to come to Parliament for its consent at all. The House will perceive that that is a different point from the point raised in the Resolution, which is simply the point of the revenue charge. But Lord Hartington laid down the great constitutional doctrine that it is going beyond the spirit of the 55th Section to do as you did in Mombasa—to use

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Indian troops outside the frontier and outside the cases excepted in the Act without the consent of Parliament, whether you impose a charge on India or whether you do not. I was glad to hear the noble lord admit—it was to me one of the most important parts of his speech—that we cannot be too vigilant, too jealously careful, at this moment especially, in regard to examining the conditions under which Indian troops may be employed: because, as the noble lord very well said, we are in an era of what I may call adventures in South Africa, when the temptation to resort to the employment of Indian troops will be immense. How immense it will be is shown even in the case of Mombasa, and it is most important that Parliament should make up its mind with something like definiteness whether or not Indian troops may he brought out of India for military operations beyond the Indian frontier without the consent of Parliament. The Indian Government in that despatch—and it is one of the most important and most significant things in the despatch—express their apprehension lest the principles which are now unfortunately defended by the noble lord should be extended and applied to cases where, as they contend, it is most inexpedient, both in the interests of India and, perhaps, in the interests of Great Britain, that there should be this unfettered right to claim on the part of the executive Government to move Indian troops into Africa, or elsewhere, whenever they think fit without the consent of Parliament. (Cheers.) It is well known now that there is a strong, and probably a growing, school, who argue that East Africa is to become a sort of annexe of the Indian Empire, and that the real and effective military base of what they expect to be our East African possessions is to be found in India and the Indian army. In these circumstances, and in view of these apprehensions, which the noble lord shares with some of us, I feel—and many in the House, irrespective of party, will feel—that nothing can be more delicate or more important in the view, not only of the present contingency, but the future, than the relations between the Indian army and the Parliament sitting at Westminster. (Cheers.) The noble lord referred to, but did not quote, the very remarkable statement of doctrine which was made in this House in 1867 by no less a person than the Prime Minister. For my own part, I am satisfied with that expression of doctrine; and upon the language used by Lord Cranborne in 1867 I shall be content to found all the arguments brought before the House. Such passages have been quoted from this remarkable statement of doctrine in the public press, and some have found their way into the despatch from the Government of India. The House will recollect the circumstances in which the language was used. It was proposed to take the Indian troops to Abyssinia. Mr. Fawcett announced his intention to move an amendment that no charge, ordinary or extraordinary, for that purpose should be put on the Government of India; and the Lord Cranborne of that day said that he entirely agreed with Mr. Fawcett, and, though he deprecated the taking of a division on the amendment, Lord Cranborne approved it, and Mr. Bright and Mr. Forster supported him. Lord Cranborne said: "I do not like India to be looked upon as an English barrack in the oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. It is bad for England, because it is always bad for us not to have that check upon the temptation to engage in little wars which can only be controlled by the necessity of paying for them." (Cheers.) Lord Cranborne then put to the House a dilemma which applies equally to the case of to-night: "If this garrison which we keep in India is, as all Indian authorities assure us, necessary for maintaining that country in security and peace, that garrison ought not to be rashly diminished. If, on the other hand, it is too large, and India can for any length of time conveniently spare these troops, then the Indian population ought not to be so unnecessarily taxed." (Cheers.) A perfectly admirable statement of doctrine, and I only regret that Lord Salisbury to-day does not adhere to it. The noble lord to-night, instead of coming to close quarters with the particular case which he was bound to present and to defend to the House, wandered over the precedents; but the noble lord himself, in what he has said in the despatch of June 30th to the Government of India, has completely swept away the whole foundation of those precedents if they are made as an argument to the Resolution which the noble lord proposed to the House. He says in his despatch to the Government of India: "It is impossible to say that the decisions which have been arrived at on previous occasions with regard to the distribution of charge for troops lent by India to Great Britain or by Great Britain to India are such that any very clear or definite doctrine can be drawn from them." What is the good of the noble lord taking up half an hour to go through the precedents of China and Perak, when he has himself told the Government of India all through that there was no doctrine to be drawn from these precedents? The important passage from the point of view of precedent is the declaration made by another noble lord, a colleague of the right hon. gentleman opposite in 1887—I mean Lord Cross. (Cheers.) This I regard as a fundamental passage; it is the opening of a completely new position by the Secretary of State for India in this country. This is what Lord Cross said in respect of the expedition of 1885, an expedition which was begun by the Government of Mr. Gladstone and which was not wound up till the Government of Lord Salisbury was in power. Lord Cross had to deal with the matter, and after he had examined the papers and the arguments he told the Treasury and the Government of India for their information and encouragement:—"The Secretary of State for India in Council, however, feels that there is much force in the general scope of the arguments"—(the arguments repeated to-night as to the incidence of the ordinary charge)—"of the Government of India, and desires to take this opportunity of expressing his earnest hope that on any future occasion, when Indian troops are employed on duties not directly attributable to the requirements of the Government of India, or despatched to a country distant from India, no portion of the expenses of such troops may be charged to India without the full assent and concurrence of the Government of that country." (Cheers.) Could anything be clearer or more definite than that? (Cheers.) Then the Treasury, in their reply, showed that they, at all events, understood the full weight and significance of this declaration of Lord Cross, for the Treasury said:—"Their lordships make no doubt that, should the occasion again arise for employing Indian troops outside India, ths views of the present Government of India and of the present Secretary of State for India in Council on the question of the expense of such employment will be respectfully weighed by the Imperial Government of the day." (Cheers.) But Lord Cross is himself a member of the Imperial Government of the day, and, therefore, there arises before our mind's eye a vision of Lord Cross, the Privy Seal, respectfully weighing the views of Lord Cross, the Secretary of State for India, and finding, apparently those views devoid of any force or weight. (Laughter.) The noble lord went on to make reference to the case of Mombasa. What is the significance of the case of Mombasa? Indian troops were sent to Mombasa in these circumstances. The Foreign Office writes to the noble lord to say that there is trouble in the East African Protectorate and suggesting that an Indian regiment should be despatched in order to inspire confidence on the part of friendly natives and to deal with the rebels. On February 21st the Foreign Office communicated to the noble lord their expectation that the charge would fall as before, on the Government of India. The Foreign Office had forgotten the *dictum* of Lord Cross; but the noble lord had not; and now we come to a series of most interesting transactions which I submit to the House, and if any hon. member be at the trouble to read with moderate care the noble lord's dealings with the Treasury in the matter of Mombasa he will find that the noble lord took up in almost every particular a position from which he now entirely recedes, and used arguments from which to-night he is running away. (Cheers.) He manfully defended Lord Cross's position. Writing, under date February 27th, to the Foreign Office, it is said:—"In reply, I am to express Lord George Hamilton's opinion that there is no justification for charging upon Indian revenues any portion of the cost of this force, so long as it is employed out of India and for purposes exclusively Imperial. In a letter dated March 25th, 1890, the Government of India lays down as a principle that, when circumstances and the safety of India permit, aid should be freely given to the Imperial Government; but that, when the objects of the expedition or campaign are unconnected with India, the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn from India should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer, just as the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn from England for an Indian expedition would be paid by Indian revenues. It appears to his Lordship that this principle is sound, and that, if the course suggested in your letter were adopted, the result would be that the cost of the operations would in effect be shared between India and the United Kingdom." (Cheers.) Let me look one by one at the arguments

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

used by the Treasury and raised by the noble lord in the Mombasa case, some of which, at any rate, he has refuted to-night. The first plea adduced by the Treasury why the Indian revenues should be chargeable with the ordinary expenses were that financial and commercial interests were at stake, and that there were "numerous British and Zanzibar dhows owned by Indians all along the German coast." On April 15th last the noble lord gave a tart answer to any contention of that kind:—"In your letter much stress is laid on the Consular reports and statistics of Zanzibar as showing that the expedition is 'connected with India.' With much greater force could it be shown that British interests are connected with the trade of India, but as already observed, no assistance is given by the exchequer of the United Kingdom in defraying the charges of the military forces in India." The second position of the Treasury in February was that the whole cost of the naval defence of India is paid for by the United Kingdom. The Treasury used that fact as an argument why India should not refuse to pay this charge; but the noble lord brushes that argument aside in a single peremptory sentence. When the Treasury tell him that the United Kingdom bear the cost of the whole of the naval defence of India he says that he cannot admit that in regard to naval defence India is under any special obligation, because the protection of the general trade of the United Kingdom in Eastern seas is undertaken by the Admiralty at the cost of the Imperial revenue. The noble lord brushed aside, therefore, any contention that we are justified in imposing an ordinary charge upon India because they do not contribute to their own naval defence. Then the third argument on the part of the Treasury was—we are still on the Mombasa case—that we were not asking India to bear any military charge in regard to the East African Protectorate, but only to consent not to save money. The noble lord to-night used the expression "the Indian Government was not to make money." The expression used hitherto, and rightly used, is that the Indian Government is not to save money as the result of employing troops in the Protectorate. India, it was stated, was not asked to defray any part of the charges, but only to lend some troops to a third party, who was making a saving out of the transaction. I was not quite sure, but I think the noble lord took up that argument and used it in defence of the attitude of the Government in reference to the expenses of the present expedition; at all events, it has been used, and I daresay will be used again. But the noble lord summarily dismissed that argument in May last when he said: "On the argument that troops lent and not replaced can continue to be paid for by India without adding to their burdens, I am to point out that the work of the army must necessarily be performed by a smaller force than is deemed requisite, thereby entailing a risk, even if it be not shown in a financial aspect, and that India would be confessedly paying for the employment of a force beyond her own frontiers from which she derives no benefit." Therefore, the noble lord, in dealing with Mombasa, has brushed aside that argument. But then a very strange transformation came over him, and all the sophistry which he had so triumphantly and so efficiently demolished in May he himself reproduces in his own despatch of June 30th. In that despatch he says: "For this important object, then, India is not asked to incur the smallest additional expenditure or to impose the slightest extra taxation." The noble lord must know quite well, or must certainly have known in May, that there is no ground in this argument whatever, and he was told this in plain and almost blunt language by members of his own council. The opinion of men of such remarkable competence and authority as Sir James Peile and Sir Donald Stewart is very important, and they pointed out with reference to the argument addressed to India that she would have to pay the troops even if the troops had not been sent, so that it made no difference, that there was a great difference between paying your own men for doing your own work in your own country and paying the same men for doing other people's work in a foreign country. (Opposition cheers.) The Treasury had urged that if India did not pay the ordinary charges there would be an actual saving in the Indian Budget, but is it unreasonable, they ask, that India should make a saving by not paying for what she does not get? (Hear, hear.) Surely it was a monstrous doctrine, they continued, that we were to impugn the Government of India because they claimed a right under these circumstances. These two sentences of Sir James Peile and Sir Donald Stewart seem to me to contain the whole of this case. Does anybody who has attended to Indian affairs at all deny that the Indian military charges are enormous? (Hear, hear.) And ought not this House, apart from the general consideration of the subject, to be glad of an opportunity of allowing the Indian Government to make a saving—small and insignificant as I admit this is—upon these military charges? Suppose that I were on such terms with the noble lord that, finding that he had got a pair of carriage horses which he was not going to use this summer, I said to him, "I have an Egyptian friend who would be glad if you would allow him to use your carriage horses." And supposing that the noble lord acquiesced, what would he think of me, or of my Egyptian friend, if at the end of the time when we were returning him his horses we sent him in a Bill for the oats, the hay, the straw, the shoeing, the grooming, and all the regular charges which he would have been at if these carriage horses had remained in his own stable? And if he said that was rather hard measure, what would he think if we reproached him by saying, "Oh, you want to make a money saving then!" (Opposition laughter.) That is an exact parallel to the position taken up by those who object to India making any saving out of this force. It is not wise, surely, to let the Indian population think that you are keeping up in India a native army larger than is necessary, and are loading her for purposes of your own with a charge which is wholly unnecessary so far as she is concerned. I am not, of course, going into the vexed question of the adjustment under normal circumstances of military charges between the Home Government and the Government of India, because there is a Departmental Committee, I think, appointed by my right hon. friend, the member for Wolverhampton, considering that point, and I confess I am not competent to express any general view upon a question of that kind. I see the Secretary to the Treasury in his place; he is a member of the Government, and a not unimportant one, and perhaps the House would like to hear his views on the subject of whether the account against India is or is not a just one—I am sure the hon. member for King's Lynn would. (Laughter.) The right hon. gentleman has said that the more we looked at these Indian military charges the more unjust they appeared to be, and the injustice was all the greater when we compared the treatment of India with the treatment which our colonies received. (Opposition cheers.) But, whether it is a just account or not, I do not think anybody will deny that the military account between ourselves and the Government of India is a pretty rigorous account, one which is without abatement or relaxation, and if you hold them to a rigorous account of this kind you cannot be surprised at the Government of India, when opportunity arises, holding you in your turn to an equally rigorous account. Before finally leaving the Mombasa case I would make one observation. The Treasury argued that the case for making a charge upon the Indian revenue was stronger—and this is really an important point—in regard to the Mombasa case than in regard to the Abyssinian expedition and the expedition of 1885. Now they have given up the case of Mombasa, therefore it seems to follow by reasonable implication and deduction that they have given up the precedents of the Abyssinian expedition of 1868 and the expedition of 1885. I submit that that is a perfectly sound argument. After all the real crux of this discussion is the question of Indian interest. (Ministerial cheers.) What is the Indian interest? I think the House must have felt that the noble lord dealt rather rapidly and perfunctorily with that vital part of the discussion. (Hear, hear.) The constructive interest of India has been strangely abused, and the noble lord I think admitted that there were cases in the past where this constructive interest of India would not now be regarded as an interest of India at all. There was the very first case of all, which I think my right hon. friend the member for the Forest of Dean will recollect—the trivial but significant case of the Sultan's ball, where the Government of India was charged with £10,000 because it was thought expedient to give a great ball in the quadrangle of the Government Offices to the Sultan of Turkey. (Laughter.) I think Mr. Fawcett said in true, though alliterative language, that that was a "masterpiece of melancholy meanness." (Laughter.) There has been a great deal of melancholy meanness since, and I think to-night the House is being asked to perform an act of melancholy meanness. (Hear, hear.) What sort of interest is it supposed that India had in the Abyssinian case? The doctrine was that you might fairly charge India if interested. The House will

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

recollect that in that case certain envoys had been maltreated by King Theodore in Abyssinia, and it was gravely argued in this House that it was to the interest of India that semi-barbarous potentates should be taught that they could not with impunity illtreat the envoys of her Majesty's Government—not in India, but in Africa. (Laughter.) Then came the Suez Canal case, and I admit that there was some force in the argument in that case. Then came the case of 1885—as a matter of fact I had nothing at all to do with the Government of 1885, of which I had not the honour to be a member. The argument was that if Osman Digna or the Mahdi did battle with Egyptian troops that would disturb the equilibrium of the Muhammadan world. The second argument was that the expedition arose out of the philanthropic and generous impulses of the people of this country, who could not bear to contemplate the possibility of what might happen to the Egyptian garrison, and that satisfaction of our generous impulses was represented from that box as being an Indian interest. (Hear, hear.)

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: Whose speech was that?

Mr. J. MORLEY: It was that of the Under Secretary of that day. I am glad to be able to refer to a high Conservative authority, who is, unfortunately, no longer among us. Sir Stafford Northcote admitted in 1867, in connexion with the Abyssinian expedition, that there were cases in which it would be the height of shabbiness and of injustice to employ Indian troops without paying their charges, such as cases affecting the balance of power in Europe, which could not be represented as an Indian interest, of affairs with France, Russia, or Italy—(cheers)—these, he said, could not be treated as Indian interest. (Cheers.) Other cases he mentioned were cases affecting our American or West Indian colonies or attempts to acquire new territory. "There can," says Sir Stafford Northcote, "in such cases be nothing more disgraceful than to employ Indian troops without paying for them." Now the noble lord claims to have laid down three principles with which little fault is to be found. I think they are a fair statement of a just view. What are the tests of what would constitute a justification for charging the Indian revenues with the cost of the troops employed in this expedition according to the principles of the noble lord? "India," he says—"must have a distinct and special interest in the matter at stake beyond that which is common to all the other members of the Empire." Those are the noble lord's tests. Lord Cross laid down a test of rather a stiffer kind. That noble lord said:—"Military duties required from the Indian forces must be duties directly attributable to the requirements of the Government of India." Suppose that we adopt Lord Cross's test. By that test this employment of Indian troops in the Sudan must have been moved or supported by the Indian Government, and, therefore, you must have been in communication with the Government of India in respect of current events in Egypt. Is there a single despatch that you can produce or cannot produce to show that you have consulted the Indian Government on current events in Egypt? Were you thinking of the military requirements of India for one instant when you ordered operations to relieve the Italians from their embarrassments at Kassala? (Cheers.) India never entered into the thoughts of the Government. No wonder that the noble lord has laboured without much success to bring before us a specific Indian interest. I think we can imagine the troubled dialogue that must have occurred between the noble lord and his advisers to whom he was giving instructions for drafting the despatch of June 30th. His advisers would say, "What is it to be?" The noble lord would say—"We are to make a charge upon the Indian revenue and we are to say there is an Indian interest involved." The advisers would say—"What is it to be this time? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Is it to be prestige with the Arab races and the Muhammadan tribes? Why we used that before. Is it to be safeguarding of the mortgages on the clove plantations which we used in February? Is it to be commercial interests or the equilibrium of the Muhammadan world as in 1885." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) "For my own part," I think the noble lord would say, "I suppose you will find nothing better to fall back upon than the Suez Canal." (Cheers and laughter.) And then the noble lord and his advisers would sit down with all the gravity they could to pen what I call—the noble lord has destroyed my character for moderate language—the most spurious and insincere paragraph that was ever printed in any despatch from any department. (Cheers.) The paragraph is this:—"The Government of India has no greater interest than the maintenance of rapid and secure transit, in times of peace and war alike, whether for commercial or for military purposes, between India and the United Kingdom. This is true of India in a sense in which it is true of no other great dependency of the British Empire, for it is upon Great Britain that India relies for the recruitment of the most important (though not the most numerous) part of its civil and military establishments, for army reliefs, for Government stores of all kinds, and, in short, for a large and essential portion of the machinery of administration and defence. It is therefore obvious that, apart from all considerations of trade, the preservation of free communication by the shortest route with a country on which she is so largely dependent is to India a matter of vital importance." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) When did the relevancy of that argument to the expedition to the Sudan occur to the Government? (Hear, hear.) During the years in which the Sudan has been out of the possession of Egypt there has been no danger to those communications. When the Mahdi and the Khalifa made a movement, did you tremble for your stores or for your machinery of administration and defence? You never trembled at all, because you knew that it had nothing to do with their safety. (Cheers.) Lord Salisbury said the other day that we have upon us a moral obligation to restore Khartum to Egypt. I may remark, with reference to that moral obligation, that it is not to become operative beyond the limits for which Egypt is willing to pay. (Cheers and laughter.) It is a very singular moral obligation which Lord Salisbury never said or thought could by any strain of construction be made an Indian moral obligation. (Cheers.) I meant to ask the noble lord another question. In 1888, in the course of a debate in another place, Lord Salisbury, whom we are now to regard as considering the restoration of the Sudan to Egypt an indispensable condition for the safety of the Suez Canal, said, "We accept the policy of abandoning the Sudan." (Cheers.) How could Lord Salisbury have said anything of that kind if the restoration of the Sudan to Egypt was an indispensable condition of the maintenance of our communications with India. (Hear, hear.) Then Lord Salisbury on that occasion used some language about Suakin which is worth quoting here. Lord Salisbury said:—"Egypt has no interest in Suakin whatever. If I were advising Egypt from the Egyptian point of view alone, I would say to Egypt abandon Suakin." The importance of Suakin, Lord Salisbury said, was in connexion with the suppression of the slave trade. But does the suppression of the slave trade come within any one of the noble lord's tests? Is it not exactly one of those interests which are common to the whole Empire? (Cheers.) We may, therefore, dismiss that argument. I wonder whether Lord Cromer will not smile when he reads the contention of the Government both in the despatch and on the lips of the noble lord that the Suez Canal was in danger from the Dervishes? Those who know more about Egypt than I do assure me that the canal is, and has been, no more in danger from these Dervishes whom you are now fighting than is the city of London. (Cheers.) I do not wonder that the noble lord in that despatch of June 30th wanders away as fast as he can from his own principles and the application of those principles and sinks into what I may call the language of weak apology. (Hear, hear.) He has used the same kind of language, though much more shortly, to-night. He says that this is going to be a very short expedition. He draws attention to the comparatively small size of the Suakin force. He anxiously protests that the assistance is essentially of a temporary nature, and he implores the Indian Government to accept the principle of loans of small bodies of troops for short periods. The noble lord must be a very sanguine man and a man of great prophetic power if he can foresee the exact time for which that Indian force will be required. (Hear, hear.) But, of coures, that does not arise, because, as I understand the matter, he has agreed that after December 31st the whole matter is to be reconsidered, and I infer from an engagement of that kind it can only mean reconsideration with a view to removing from the revenue of India the whole of the ordinary as well as the extraordinary charges. I would remind the House that this Resolution, if it is passed to-night does not limit the number of months during which this force can be used. We pass this Resolution as a general and not a terminable Resolution. I cannot imagine a much weaker case for resisting the appeal of the Indian Government than that the expedition is small and the time is limited. (Hear, hear.) The noble lord has told us to-night that the whole sum for which the Government of India is

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

being, as it were, flouted is about £35,000. This proceeds from the specially Imperial party, and the glory of the Empire is to be tarnished for £35,000! (Cheers and Ministerial cries of "No!") I am sure to a great many gentlemen opposite this is not a matter of party, and that they are just as much ashamed of this vote as the most debased Little Englander. (Hear, hear.) I should like now to ask the House to listen to some words written by Lord Lawrence to Sir Stafford Northcote in the year 1868. He used this language:—"I cannot admit that India has the slightest interest in the question at issue between England and King Theodore. We shall be neither stronger nor weaker here, if he is duly punished for his misdeeds. Abyssinia is too distant from India; the communications between the two countries are too slight for the people of India to take any interest in what goes on in the former part of the world. The true grounds of the war are the vindication of England's honour. . . . If England could not afford to pay the expenses of the war, and if the finances of India were in a flourishing condition, the Government of India, as the representatives of the interests of the people, might perhaps have been asked to contribute its quota. But the case is exactly the other way. India is really a poor country. The actual condition of the masses of the people is a bare, I might say a miserable, existence. We, its rulers, are at our wit's ends to increase the amount of taxation, to devise new sources of public revenue which may be remunerative, and not extremely unpopular. And it is at this time that it has been decided by the Parliament of England that India must bear a portion of the expenses of a war in which it has really and truly no interest. . . . . India is treated very differently to the colonies. No one would think of asking any of the latter to pay a portion of the war expenses of Abyssinia." I would ask the House to recollect what Lord Lawrence pressed on Sir Stafford Northcote in 1868, and to remember that while we are chattering here about £35,000, the Indian Government is not in such easy circumstances that even £35,000 would be of no consequence to it. (Cheers.) There are two considerations that come into our minds in connection with to-night's transaction. The first is the effect of these proceedings of ours on the credit and authority of the Government of India with those over whom they rule. (Hear, hear.) There are these men, diligently discharging on behalf of this nation their share in the most noble and beneficent task that any nation in the history of the world has even undertaken—(cheers)—and invested with every shred of authority with which you can clothe them. What do you suppose will be the effect on the moral authority of the Government of India, which is far more the secret of our power in India than mere military establishments, when the population of India see the Government of India treated with so little ceremony that decisions are taken on questions without waiting for more than a mere brief telegraphic summary? (Cheers) Do you think that the people of India do not understand that the decision arrived at in so summary a manner is a slight on the Government of India? When they see, moreover, that the pledge given to the Government of India in 1887 by Lord Cross, that their full concurrence should be required when anything not demanded by the requirements of India took place, is broken, what will be the effect in India upon the contentment with the rule of this nation and this Parliament? (Cheers.) What will be the effect when they find such a statement of the case against this nation and Parliament as is contained in the masterly despatch of the Government of India? (Cheers.) The Government of India gave the House a warning. They say: "We have already adverted in this despatch to the opinions of the Government of India previously recorded, showing that the imposition on Indian Revenues of burdens for services in which India is in no way interested would be an impolitic course to adopt. We would add that, since the passing of the Indian Councils Act of 1892, the annual Financial Statement of the Governor General in Council comes under discussion in the Legislative Council of the Governor General; and from the discussions which have since taken place it will be seen that the finances are watched and scrutinised, and their utilisation for purposes which are viewed as illegitimate or unauthorised is vigorously challenged." What do we read in *The Times* this morning from India?—"The decision of the Ministry with regard to the expenses of the Suakin brigade has been received here with something like indignant surprise, as the case presented by the Government of India in the despatch made public on Friday seems an overwhelming one. For some time to come it is certain that there will be the strongest denunciation of the selfish policy of the home authorities in every newspaper, English and native, throughout the country. The impression thus produced will be a lasting one, for a belief will obtain that Indian interests will be sacrificed on future occasions. The weakness of the India Office in yielding to the Treasury is much commented upon." The risk of all this mischief is to be run for the sake of £35,000, because somebody in Whitehall can patch up some sort of a case. This is not a question for an arithmetician or an accountant. (Cheers.) The question is whether this is an item which this House ought to exact; but even the accountant's view renders it doubtful whether there is any fair ground for the imposition of this charge, and where there is a doubt clearly this House ought to decide the doubt against itself—(cheers)—and in favour of those who have no representative in the House and whose only representatives, namely, the Government of India, have protested against this plan. I do not say that this House is capable of supervising every minute detail of administration in India as we supervise administration in England. I do not think that it is desirable that we should be too keen to intermeddle in Indian administration; but this Resolution is in opposition to the past opinions of great authorities now sitting in the Cabinet, and is based upon pleas and arguments which were repudiated by the noble lord in a parallel case not two months ago. Its foundation in the plea that the Suez Canal may be endangered by the Dervishes is a spurious and insincere foundation; the Resolution tarnishes the honour of England in the very field where our work is most glorious, and it is because it does this that I beg to move the Amendment that stands in my name. (Cheers.)

MR. J. MACLEAN.

MR. J. MACLEAN asked to be allowed to second the amendment, because he wished the principle of fair play to India to be adhered to, and deeply regretted the course which the Government had taken in bringing this resolution forward. He felt no doubt in his own mind that if this question were left to the independent judgment of the House the Government would not have very many supporters that night. The noble lord's speech seemed to show that his heart was not in this business, and it was difficult to suppose that the Secretary of State who had showed conclusively that India ought not to be charged for the expenses of the regiment sent to Mombasa could really think that India ought to pay for the expedition now under consideration. The noble lord must have allowed his better judgment to be overborne by the representations of the British Treasury. It had been said by the Secretary to the Treasury that India ought not to expect to save money because her troops had been sent to Suakin. But the saving of money was just what the Government on their side desired to effect. If Indian troops had not been sent to Suakin, we should have been obliged to send British troops there. These British troops were now at home, and should any little war arise elsewhere than in Egypt, they would be available. A great deal had been said about precedents. For his part he was in favour of establishing a new precedent, if necessary, in connection with this matter. The speeches and despatches of Lord Salisbury and Lord Cross had been cited; all showed their great anxiety not to make use without payment of the immense reserve of military strength that we possessed in India. But there was a still higher authority he could cite. What was the precedent set by Lord Beaconsfield in 1878? The First Lord of the Treasury, early in the Session, reminded them, perhaps somewhat unnecessarily, that Lord Beaconsfield was dead. That was true, and pity 'twas 'twas true. But there were still many members on the Ministerial Benches who borrowed Lord Beaconsfield's name and would like to be guided by his example. When Lord Beaconsfield brought Indian troops to Malta in 1878, he did not charge the Indian Government a single rupee for the expenses of that expedition. If they were to be guided by precedents, they could not have a better precedent than that. That high-minded and far-seeing statesman was too great a man to care about paltry considerations of the cost incurred by the British Treasury. He wanted to show our enemies that we had a great reserve in the army of India, which could be called upon to help us whenever we should have any difficulty with European nations. As long as he taught that lesson, Lord Beaconsfield cared very little about the money part of the matter. He dissented altogether from the view that seemed to be held that India could not be shown to have a very im-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

portant interest in Egypt. When at the beginning of this century the first expedition was sent to Egypt Lord Wellesley, who was Governor General of India, said that he had come to the conclusion that to expel the French from Egypt was necessary for the future security of the British Empire in India. That statement of policy still held true. Both Napoleon and Nelson were agreed that whatever power could bestride the Isthmus of Suez and command the valley of the Nile would become masters of India. Some people, he knew, thought that we ought to abandon the Mediterranean, and that India could be protected by troops and munitions of war sent by the Cape of Good Hope. A friend of his was anxious the other day that Indian troops should be sent to South Africa, to aid us in our difficulties there. It was evident therefore that in the future Indian troops might be called upon to serve in any part of Africa. Well, supposing that this precedent which they were asked to establish were set up would it not open the door to unlimited abuse of the principle of sending Indian troops to Africa? The proposal of the Government might lead possibly to dangerous consequences. The Secretary of State for India, in his despatch in reply to the Indian Government, laid down three principles, which showed a desire on his part to do what was right towards India, but the noble lord had apparently forgotten certain things which it was essential to pay regard to if those principles were to be carried out. In the first place, the burdens of Imperial administration ought to be fairly distributed among all parts of the British Empire, but India at present bore far more than her fair share of Imperial burdens. Before they put a fresh burden upon the revenues of India they ought to examine this question as a whole, and see that all the component parts of the Empire shared the Imperial burdens fairly according to their respective capacities. When a short time ago there was a discussion about the incidence of new taxation in India, the noble lord said that all that he asked for was perfect equality of treatment for Bombay and Lancashire, and he examined the tariff with the most minute and microscopic nicety of discrimination in order to see whether the balance did not incline by a hair's breadth in favour of India, and when he found himself able to shift a large portion of taxation from Lancashire into Bombay he claimed that he had secured perfect equality of treatment. Why was there not to be perfect equality of treatment now? What was the burden that fell upon India at the present moment? India paid 24½ millions out of a total expenditure of 70 millions on the armaments of the Empire. That was to say, India paid more than one-third of the total charges for the armaments of this immense British Empire, while the self-governing colonies only contributed an insignificant fraction of the whole expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer lately showed that the Army and Navy charges in England had arisen from £30,000,000 in 1885-6 to £38,000,000 in 1895-6, or an increase of 30 per cent. in ten years. He had compared these figures with a return relating to India, and found that the military charges in India rose from 17 millions in 1884-5 to 24¼ millions in 1894-5, or an increase of about 44 per cent. in ten years. They must remember, too, that the burden of responsibility now laid on the Indian Government was immensely heavier than it was in former times. During the last twelve years, since the annexation of Upper Burma, they had added immense unproductive territories to the area of British India; they had increased her army by 30,000 to 35,000 men, and they had compelled her, practically, to subsidise or to pay blackmail to the whole population of Central Asia from the Indian frontier up to the Russian frontier. And look at the enormous extent of territory India now had to defend. She had to maintain an army of 225,900 men, because they had given her a frontier of something like 1,500 miles to defend against Russia; and now to improve the matter they had given her a frontier down on the south-eastern side of India to defend against France. In addition to that, look at the charges with which they saddled her. Not only did she pay the expense of every British soldier sent out to garrison India from the moment he left these shores, but India had also to pay a very large sum for the training of these soldiers in the United Kingdom. The sum of £600,000 a year was paid by India for that purpose. It had been said that night, as a set-off against that, that India paid nothing for the British Navy. That was not the case. India paid £106,000 as an appropriation in aid of the expenditure of the Navy.

Admiral FIELD: Only this year.

Mr. MACLEAN said she paid it regularly, and he should say that that was a larger amount of money than would pay the whole expense of the East Indian Squadron. If they compared that with what was done by Australia or any of their colonies, they would see how much they took from India for this purpose. Not only was that contribution paid, but India had to maintain two monitors at Bombay for the defence of that port; she had also to purchase gunboats and torpedo-boats and catchers, and she had to maintain, as well, an Indian Marine, which did all the trooping service around her own coasts, and some of the vessels of which were used to convey the troops to Suakin. He thought it would be admitted that India really at the present moment paid a much larger share than she ought to do of the Imperial burdens. He might mention that, in addition to these charges, India maintained the agencies in the Persian Gulf, subsidised the Sultan of Muscat, and supported such unpaying possessions as Aden and the Somali dependencies on the opposite side of the Gulf. Altogether, if they included the subsidy to the Legation in Persia, and what she spent in China, India was made responsible for the greater part of their Imperial expenditure in the whole of the East beyond the Isthmus of Suez, and no further burdens ought to be placed on her until these matters were fairly enquired into, and until they saw whether she did not at present pay more than her fair share of Imperial expenditure. He opposed the motion on the ground that it was being pressed against the wishes of the Government and the people of India. It was being pressed against the public opinion of this country also. The Government has no supporter in the press who said that this was a fair charge for them to make; and he was astonished at the perversity of a Government which, after throwing over with a light heart the most important legislative measure of the Session, now came forward and obstinately persisted in laying this charge on the people of India. He did not think the noble lord in his speech, or the Government as a body, had shown any adequate sense of the value of India to this country, or they would not have ventured to make such a proposition. What was it that made England occupy such an immense place in the imagination of mankind, except that she possessed the wealth, the power, and the glory that attached to the dominion of India? India was of far more value to them, in matters of trade, than all their self-governing colonies put together. They were told the other day that they ought to enter into some new-fangled arrangement in order to obtain a qualified free trade with 300 millions of people. Why, they had perfect free trade with 250 millions already. India demanded no preferential treatment for her goods, and she would not get any, as they knew. Their friends from Lancashire would take care of that. And he might say, in a parenthesis, that he would warn his friends from Lancashire, who came down there to demand that warlike expeditions should be sent for Imperial purposes, if they thought India was going to pay for them, they must be prepared to bear the fresh taxation which would be necessary to enable her to do so. They knew that India could barely pay her way now. She had had to increase her taxation in order to do it, and here they were ready to make fresh charges on her. They knew she had had to increase the pay of her native troops in order that she might obtain an adequate supply of men, and General Brackenbury had stated that further charges would have to be made in order to increase the supply of English officers for the native army. With all these things within their recollection, how could they dare to say to the Government and people of India, that they must pay this paltry charge to relieve the British Treasury. No doubt they had a despotic Government in India, and could do pretty much as they would, but it ought not to be necessary to tell the British House of Commons that no despotism, however strong it might appear, could exist for a long time unless it was based on fair administration and on the goodwill of the people subject to it. He had no doubt that goodwill would be forthcoming in time of trouble if they treated India fairly. An hon. and gallant gentleman said that night, in an interruption, that they did not call upon Canada to pay for these Imperial expeditions, because she helped them voluntarily. Had not the princes of India helped them voluntarily only lately in the Chitral expedition? Were not the Imperial service troops sent up there at the cost of the princes, and not at the cost of the Government? And if any greater danger threatened this country, if the occasion arose when England was engaged in a struggle for her very existence against a coalition of European

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Powers, then England would look to her colonies and her dependencies for aid, and would expect that aid to be given voluntarily, ungrudingly, and without counting the cost. Then India would be happy and proud to take her part in that Titanic struggle, if meanwhile, they did not irritate her people and weaken the foundations of their rule thereby behaving in a shabby and sordid manner unworthy of a magnanimous people. They had, in his opinion, rightly refused to give India representative institutions, which were inconsistent with the character and traditions of the people; but because they had taken upon themselves the great responsibility of governing that country without representative institutions, it was all the more necessary that they should be scrupulously careful in their dealings with India. It was a case in which the maxim *noblesse oblige* applied with especial weight. He had risen to to second the amendment because he believed that the claim of India in this matter was founded on reason and justice and was supported by authority and above all, that it appealed with an irresistible force to the sense of honour of the English people.

MR. VICARY GIBBS.

MR. VICARY GIBBS said he supported the amendment, because he believed that, in taking this course, he was doing his duty, not merely by India, but by England as well. There was one part of the speech of the right hon. gentleman opposite with which he could not quite agree. He seemed to have fears that, in consequence of the extension of their territory in Africa, the demands on the Indian troops would increase. He quite agreed that these demands were likely to increase, and he desired that they should be able to be increased. He thought that, considering the immense difficulties they had in England in producing a sufficient army for their Imperial requirements, it was most desirable that they should be able to draw upon India; but it was most desirable that they should draw upon her on terms which were satisfactory to the Government of India as well as to the Government of England. He could not think that it was in the interest of this country that they should, for a trivial sum such as this, produce a feeling in India that they were prepared to sacrifice the opinion of the Indian Government to suit the economic views of the British Treasury. There was another point to which the right hon. gentleman referred on which he should like to comment. It had been said by the noble lord the Secretary of State for India, that this case was differentiated from that of Mombasa, because Egypt had a special interest for India. He had no doubt that that was said, but consider for a moment whether Egypt could possibly be indifferent to the result of English warlike operations in any part of the world. India depended upon England, and if the present course could be defended, then in any warlike operations upon which England embarked it could be shown that India had an interest for which in his judgment, it was as much entitled to be called upon to pay as it was in the present case. This was not a question of the retention of Egypt in which they were concerned. Could any one on the Treasury Bench get up and say that since the fall of Khartum, there had been any sort of representation from the Indian Government that they regarded their interest as seriously endangered, or the Suez Canal seriously endangered because the Sudan had passed out of the control of Egypt? If it was essential to the proper holding of India that Egypt should belong to England, what became of all the statements that as soon as Egypt was strong enough to run alone they should leave Egypt? It seemed to him that the plan of the Government was unjust, mean and impolitic, and on that account he felt compelled to support the amendment.

On the return of teh SPEAKER after the usual interval,

MR. BHOWNAGGREE.

MR. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE said that he had approached the consideration of the Resolution, since it was put down on paper, with some misgivings, but, at the same time, in view of the promise made with regard to the production of the despatch from the Indian Government, he had kept his mind perfectly open. They now had the despatch of the Government of India before them, with the reply of the Secretary of State, whose eloquent explanation he had also heard with attention, and, having kept his mind open up to that afternoon, he had now come to a conclusion which he would presently state. He must, however, first offer his congratulations to her Majesty's Government on the one hand and to India on the other, on the fresh proof which had been accorded on behalf of the British nation of the confidence which was felt in the loyalty, the devotion, and the valour of the Indian troops, by their being called upon to serve in Egypt. (Cheers.) He wished he could carry this sentiment of congratulation further into the consideration of this question; but he was sorry he felt himself utterly unable to do so. The noble lord had referred to precedents; and there were earlier precedents than those which had been cited. In the first China War, under the East India Company, India paid, as is now demanded, the ordinary expenses; but it must be remembered that between the company and the Government of the day there were mutual relations involving reciprocal concessions. In the Persian Expedition India bore the ordinary charges and one-half the extraordinary charges, and there was good reason for it, because the Persian Expedition was undertaken mainly in the interests of India. To the third precedent, that of the second China War, he wished to direct special attention, because Sir Stafford Northcote, in submitting a Resolution to the House on the Abyssinian Expedition, admitted that no expenses at all were charged to India, and the reason he gave was that "much tenderness was felt for India on account of the Mutiny." Looking at the discontent with which the present motion was regarded in India, the expressions used by Sir Stafford Northcote might be recalled with significance and force. The noble lord, the Secretary for India, had laid special stress upon the decision to which Lord Cross came in 1887 as the result of the representations made by the Government of India. And in Lord Cross's despatch dated February 3rd, 1887, it was stated that he had impressed upon the Treasury that, in the event of the employment of Indian troops outside India in future, no part of the expenditure should be charged to India without the previous assent of the Governor General in Council. That was what he might describe as the final decision of her Majesty's Government in regard to the employment of Indian troops outside India; and he should have thought the noble lord would have insisted upon the observance at any cost of the principle enunciated in that despatch by Lord Cross. He gratefully acknowledged that the noble lord had carried that principle to its right conclusion when he resisted the demand of the Treasury to call upon India to pay the ordinary charges of the troops sent to Mombasa a few months ago. He should have thought that the noble lord would have had no difficulty in pursuing that principle again, and in insisting that the ordinary charges of the Indian troops sent to Suakin now should not be claimed from India. He regarded this matter from more points of view than one. It had been attempted to be made out that India had an interest in the present complications in Egypt, but when they looked back on the history of the origin of the expedition to Dongola, and searched the speeches of the Ministers in regard to it, they would not find the slightest allusion to any interest India had in the expedition. The purpose of the expedition was acknowledged to be purely Egyptian—namely, to recover the lost territory around Dongola. No later than Friday last the First Lord of the Treasury stated that the expedition was in the interest of Egypt; that it should be carried out at the cost of Egypt, and that if it should happen—a contingency which the right hon. gentleman did not anticipate—that England had to come to the financial assistance of Egypt, the House of Commons would, of course, be taken fully into the confidence of the Government. If, then, it be a fact that not a penny out of the British Treasury was to be devoted to this expedition, why should a large sum be taken out of the Indian Treasury for such a purpose? It was not because of the £35,000 or £40,000 which would be charged to India that he objected to the action of the Government, but it was because of the principle involved. He denied that India had even the remotest interest in the expedition to Dongola. Whether or not the Egyptian Government succeeded in regaining the lost territory of the Sudan, no one can say that the Suez Canal was in danger—(hear, hear)—and, that being admitted, the last shred of excuse for saying that India had an interest in the expedition was removed. (Hear, hear.) He would make any sacrifice in reason to maintain an intimate loyal connection between India and England, and if her Majesty's Government were to appeal to the Indian Government saying that they required the loan of Indian soldiers and Indian vessels for some Imperial object, he should support their demand, at least to

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

some extent. But he could not support the present demand when it was based on the assumption that the interests of India were involved. If the logic of that statement were once accepted, it would be said that the interests of India were at stake whenever we went to war in any country the way to which lay through the Suez Canal. (Hear, hear.) When Indian soldiers were called upon to fight against Britain's foes, statesmen proclaimed their sympathy with Indian interests; we then say to him—

"You are good in heart and hand;
You are a credit to your calling and to all your native land.
May your luck be never failing, may your love be ever true,
God bless you, Tommy Atkins, here's your country's love to you."

But when the battle is won and peace restored, how is this love expressed? When in our own colonies, as well as in foreign countries, Indian subjects of her Majesty—not only coolies, but merchants and traders, men who helped to make British settlements—were treated in a manner that was a disgrace to the Empire, were robbed of the rights that belonged to them not only as citizens of the Empire, but as human beings, without a word of protest from Statesmen who have the direction of foreign and colonial affairs, no wonder this talk about care for Indian interests was regarded as hollow by the whole community of India. The people of India keenly watched how their interests were guarded by the Imperial Government of the day, whatever Party was in power, and mistakes like those he had alluded to shook their belief in the beneficence of British rule in India. He was sorry that he had been compelled to say these things; but he should have neglected his duty to the people of India if he had not given expression to the sense of deep injustice which the demand made in the noble lord's Resolution aroused in their minds. (Opposition cheers.) He should think that the British spirit of fair play would recoil from the attempt to relieve the burdens of the British taxpayer at the expense of such a poor country as India. (Hear, hear!) Such an attempt was acceptable neither in the sight of God nor of man. "In the house of the righteous there is much treasure, but in the revenues of the wicked there is trouble;" and there would be trouble some day if the unwise policy contained in the Resolution were persisted in, and those who made it their mission in life to expound to the people of India the benefits of British rule were thereby rendered powerless for good. He besought her Majesty's Government to withdraw the Resolution—(cheers)—and if they would not do that, let them at least place the charges with regard to the Indian troops on the same basis as those for the English troops—a debt to be discharged out of Egyptian funds. The Resolution would give rise to an amount of discontent in India which few hon. members could realise. (Hear, hear!)

MR. R. B. HALDANE.

Mr. R. B. HALDANE said that he would be expressing the feeling of many Members when he referred to the pleasure which it had given him to listen to the speech of the hon. member who had just sat down. The hon. member had spoken as a native of India with singular moderation and directness, and, what was most important, in no sense on party lines. He agreed that the conduct of both parties on this subject had been not a little inconsistent. There had been great inconsistencies in the course which the Leaders of the Liberal Parties had taken; but a point had been reached when it was possible for the House to lay down principles which should be just to India, and at the same time fit to be relied on in the future. The doctrine laid down by the noble lord the Secretary of State was apparently this—that it was right for the Government, two months after the event, to ask the sanction of the House of Commons to the use of Indian troops for Imperial purposes. That doctrine was in accordance neither with the spirit nor the letter of the Constitution. It had been challenged more than once, and it would be wrong to allow this occasion to go by without a protest, lest silence should be construed into an admission to be quoted in the future. It was of great constitutional importance to lay down the principle that in the interests, not only of the people of India, but of this country also, it was not right for the Government of the day to assume the legal and constitutional power of making use of Indian troops—a standing army outside the standing army over which Parliament had control—for the purpose of sudden and unexpected expeditions and small wars. This question had been raised in connection with Abyssinia, Egypt, Burma, and Malta, and on the last occasion the very strongest protest was made by the present President of the Council then Lord Hartington. The noble Lord said: "I maintain that the powers of the Government for making war are far greater than they have been at any previous time; and I believe that the precautions and restrictions which Parliament has always thought it necessary to take against the existence of a standing army should not be relaxed, but rather strengthened." He did not admit that the days were gone by when it was necessary to maintain the doctrine contained in the Bill of Rights—that the House of Commons alone should have control over the size of the standing army at the disposition of the Government. There was no pretence to a divine right of kings now-a-days; but there was a pretence to a divine right of Cabinets and Executive Governments to undertake and spring upon the country expeditions on which the country had not been consulted, and which came to the notice of the House for the first time when it was asked for its approval to a policy which it was to late to revoke. He did not wish unduly to limit the power of the Government in the conduct of affairs. At times they must act upon an emergency, as when they had to face an unexpected call to war, which arose through no choice of their own. Then the Government took the responsibility of immediate action, and the House of Commons in such circumstances, would always be ready to give its sanction and support to the Government. But that was not the case in the present instance. The House and the country knew nothing of this expedition to the Sudan until they read of it in the newspapers; and then long after the expedition had been undertaken and the Indian troops had been despatched, the Government asked Parliament for its approval of steps which could not be retraced. The House ought to declare that it had not relaxed its control over the means which the Executive possessed for waging war. It was high time to show that the House had not parted with any of the privileges which it undoubtedly possessed at one time. Before the Government could make use of Indian troops, it was the business of the Government to get the previous and not the subsequent consent of Parliament. There were certain admissions which he was ready to make. In the first place he would admit that the command of the Indian troops was in the Crown; but the extent of the troops which were at the command of the Crown was a question entirely for the House of Commons, and not for the Executive at all. His second proposition was that the Imperial troops in the Queen's dominions were limited to those the raising of which was sanctioned by the annual Army Acts with one exception only—namely, the troops in India, which were for the use of the Government of India only within the limits of India, unless Parliament should give its consent to their use outside those limits, just as it might give its consent to the increase of the ordinary Army. There was nothing in the India Government Act which contradicted in any way the doctrine he had laid down. That doctrine was as true to-day as when it was first laid down. Lastly, he contended that in all cases of the kind in question it was necessary for the Government to obtain the consent of Parliament before they acted, and that this consent was to be distinguished from subsequent consent or acceptance. (Hear, hear!) The argument put forward by the noble lord the Secretary for India, if it was justifiable, would come to this: that it would be within the power of the Government of the day, without the previous consent of Parliament, to take Indian troops out of India to Gibraltar and elsewhere, or even to bring them, and move them, in ships on the coasts of this island. The effect, of course, would be that the Government would have the power of increasing the strength of the standing army of this country, independently of the consent or control of Parliament. (Hear, hear!) He was enunciating no new principle. In fact, there was no principle of our Constitution that had been laid down with more persistency and greater clearness since the reign of the Stuarts than that the standing army in time of peace was under the control of Parliament, and that the previous consent of Parliament was necessary to the increase of the Army. It had likewise been laid down with equal clearness in the India Government Act, 1858, and other Acts, that, except under clearly-defined circumstances affecting India herself, Indian troops should not be employed by the Government of this country beyond the frontiers of India

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

itself, without the previous consent of Parliament. By the Army Annual Act, moreover, Parliament controlled, year after year, the numbers of our standing army in time of peace, and the very object of the Act was to prevent Governments of the day raising a greater force than was necessary, and to protect the country from small and sudden military expeditions. (Hear, hear!) But the noble lord invited the House to throw over altogether the main principle of the Army Annual Act, for if the Government of the day had the power of employing Indian or Colonial troops in an expedition they were carrying out, the effect practically was to increase the force of our standing army, independent of the consent or control of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) But he denied absolutely that any Government of this country had that power. As long as the Bill of Rights and the Army Annual Bill remained, it would be a direct violation of the constitution to bring troops from any foreign source into any part of the Queen's dominions without the previous consent of Parliament. It was equally a violation of the laws that had been enacted in relation to our government of India to take her troops beyond her frontier, as in this case, without first consulting Parliament. It was a violation, both in the spirit and the letter, of the Army Annual Bill, and it behoved Parliament to be very jealous of its prerogative in this matter. (Hear, hear) He believed there was as much danger from Cabinets to-day as there was in the days of the Stuarts. More and more a tendency was becoming apparent on the part of Cabinets to consider themselves free from the control of Parliament, especially in regard to small military expeditions, such as the one under discussion, at a distance and in time of peace. And Parliament should be alive to the danger. In 1858, when the India Bill was discussed, Mr. Gladstone was so conscious of the difficulty and danger involved in the matter—was so anxious to make it clear that the Indian army should not be used by the Government of this country in addition to our standing army in such expeditions as that now in Egypt, that he moved a clause on the point which was actually carried by the House of Commons, and was only altered somewhat when it reached the House of Lords. The clause was in these terms—that, except for preventing or repelling actual invasion, or for meeting any sudden and urgent necessity, Her Majesty's forces in India should not be employed for any military purpose beyond the external frontiers of India without the consent of Parliament. As he had said, the clause was somewhat altered by the House of Lords, because it seemed to restrict unduly the prerogative of the Crown, but in the end it was passed in the form in which it now stood in the Act—Clause 55, and it also contained the words that—"the revenues of India cannot, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applied to defray the expense of any military operation beyond the frontiers of that country." Was there in these words any repeal of the Act of Settlement—anything inconsistent with the Mutiny Act, or with the doctrine in point if its control of its standing army is to be subject to Parliament? Was there anything in this to justify any reasonable man in saying that the consent of Parliament was consent after the event, instead of before the event? Mr. Gladstone said the word "consent," whether used in an Act of Parliament or in the House meant previous consent. If that was the case it was impossible to allow this matter to pass now without some sort of protest. The doctrine of the noble lord amounted to this, that for the future it would be said, you allow without protestation a motion to pass on the footing that it was within the right of the Government and the perogative of the Crown to make use of Indian troops as an extra and additional force with which to wage their wars. That would be a very convenient doctrine, especially when taken with the addendum that they might charge the people of India with the cost so long as the charge was not an extra charge.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I only said on that point and on many others that lawyers differed.

Mr. HALDANE pointed out that in regard to the Mombasa expedition, the noble lord said no Resolution was necessary. That meant that the Government had the right to take troops for the Mombasa expedition or anything of the kind without going to Parliament. He maintained that they were face to face with a very grave question of principle. He did not wish to raise it in any acrimonious spirit. He was only taking the ground which had been taken by the party opposite. It was true that the Liberal party had been guilty of inconsistencies and injustices with the administration of the forces under the Government Act of 1858; but this, at least, they might say, that some of the severest criticism of their methods, some of the hardest things said against them, some of the most definite layings-down of principles came from hon. members prominent on the Front Bench opposite, and who were now themselves acting contrary to the doctrines they had previously maintained. These principles ought to be maintained. They could not be laid aside and regarded as obsolete because they had to deal with a Cabinet instead of a crowned head. He supported the amendment, in the first place, for the sake of India. We were stronger than the people of India. But we held the power as trustees, and were not entitled to abuse our trust by making it something which was used for our own profit and not for theirs. The Government of India had their interest in these matters. Surely of that the Government of India were the best judges, and when they sent despatches entreating the Government of the day to hold their hand, and pointing out that misunderstanding and bad feeling would be aroused in India, then surely it was not only the province but the duty of the House of Lords to step forward and say that the course alike of generosity and policy compelled them to resist the proposal that the revenues of India should be used in a matter about which India had not been consulted, and about which India, except in the most remote way, had neither lot nor part. In the second place, he supported the motion for the sake of a great and useful vital principle. Just as Parliament limited the powers of the Crown in days gone by, so he held that Parliament must continue to limit the power of the Government over the troops which it had at its command. He believed that the constitutional safeguard of the Act of Settlement remained intact and unaffected. He believed that the doctrine laid down by Lord Camden and Lord Bathurst, by the great statesmen of a century ago, and by Lord Hartington and Lord Selborne more recently, was true to-day; and with that faith, and in that conviction, and with a feeling that it was a matter upon which all sides of the House had done well to unite in raising their testimony, he, for one, would support the amendment.

MR. E. LAWRENCE.

MR. EDWIN LAWRENCE said the House had listened to a most interesting constitutional speech, but it might be worth while to bring the House back for a few moments to the question at issue. That question was whether India had or had not an immediate interest in the expedition now undertaken in the Sudan. He held with those who said years ago that no power could hold Egypt which did not also hold the Upper Nile. Therefore he felt when England years ago abandoned the Upper Nile she had taken a course which sooner or later she would have to reverse, and that she would have to reconquer the Upper Nile. Knowing something of engineering, he believed it was possible for a civilised Power holding the Upper Nile to so divert its tributaries that a rising of the Nile should be no longer possible. Therefore he held that it was of vital importance that those who held Egypt should also hold the Upper Nile, and he appealed to his hon. friend who spoke on behalf of the people of India, and whose presence they welcomed in the House of Commons, that India was interested in the expedition, because she was interested in Egypt and the Upper Nile. With these views he felt that it was right that India should pay some portion of the cost. But as a matter of fact India was not asked to pay anything. She was only asked to allow a certain number of troops now in barracks to have an opportunity of fighting in Egypt. He believed there was no body of Indian troops that would not like to be selected for the work, and that nothing would make the Service more popular in India than the movement of these Indian troops to the Sudan. In these circumstances, he failed to see any reason for the great protest of the Indian Press. India's future depended on the preservation of the way to India. If ever we ceased to hold the pass through the Suez Canal we should lose our hold over India. Therefore India was interested as much, if not more, than this country, and he felt sure that when the matter was fully understood in India the Indian people would feel that the Government were taking the right course. He strongly supported the Motion.

SIR ANDREW SCOBLE.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE said he certainly agreed with the last

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Indian army was ready to fight side by side

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

with our own army in any campaign where the dignity, honour, and interest of England were concerned. Therefore he had no doubt—though his hon. friend appeared to be under some misapprehension as to the sort of duty they would have to discharge at Suakin—that these troops would go there cheerfully in the hope that they might have a chance sooner or later of going to the front. But that was not what they had to consider. He was very glad that the debate had not been a party debate. What they had to consider was this. What were the precedents which ought to guide them, on this occasion, and in the absence of precedents, what was the course which the House ought to take? It was admitted by the Secretary of State that there was really no governing precedent in this matter, and the House had to make a precedent to-night. The nearest precedent was that of 1885, in which the House came to a decision behind the backs of the Government of India. Since that decision it had been recognised, both at the India Office and the Treasury, that the Government of India had the right to be consulted before any expenditure on this account was adopted. Therefore they had to consider what they ought to do on this occasion. His noble friend took credit to himself for having in his last despatch laid down three principles which ought to guide the Government. The noble lord wrote: "The true principles upon which the relations between England and India should rest, are that the Indian army should be considered a branch of her Majesty's Imperial army." That, he thought, everyone in the House would confirm—"That, when circumstances and the safety of India permit, aid should be freely given to the Imperial Government." That was another point which would command universal acquiescence—"But when the objects of the expedition or campaign are unconnected with India, the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn from India should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer, just as the whole of the expenses of the troops drawn England for an Indian expedition would be paid by Indian revenues." It was the third point they had to decide; it was for the House to determine upon whom was to rest the responsibility of saying whether the objects of the expedition were connected or unconnected with India. He was ready to admit that in the interest of Egypt it was proper that the Sudan campaign should be undertaken, and that if in pursuing the present Sudan policy we could give a helping hand to our friends the Italians further south, it was our duty and our interest to do so. But the Sudan operations did not seem to him to be in the slightest degree connected with Indian interests. The noble lord told them that the free passage to India was a desirable thing to maintain. He evidently had in mind the Suez Canal, but did anybody with the slightest geographical knowledge mean to say it made any difference whatever to the free use of the Suez Canal whether the Egyptians were at Wady Halfa or at Dongola? He could not understand how it could be said that this expedition had even an indirect bearing upon the free transit of our troops, our commerce, and our travellers between England and India. This very question arose in 1885, and how was it dealt with by the Government of India of that day? They had not an opportunity of putting their views before Parliament before the Vote was passed, but they wrote—"There is no question now of the safety of the Suez Canal, which was urged in 1882 as a reason why the Indian Government should bear its share in the expenditure then to be incurred. The operations taking place in the Sudan have no connection with any Indian interests, and lie altogether outside the sphere of our responsibilities. We can look for neither advantage nor loss from them. The pretentions and the aims of the leaders of the rising in Africa are a matter of indifference to the Government of India, which is in no way interested in disputing or putting down by force the claims of political or religious pretenders in regions of the world remote from its own limits and from those of its neighbours." If that argument was good then it was equally good now, and by whom was that put forward? By the Government of Lord Dufferin, than whom there was no statesman of a more Imperial mind. Those arguments ought to have been present to the mind of the Government before they resolved to make the present demand. Precisely the same view was taken of the Sudan operations by Lord Elgin's Government as was taken in 1885 by Lord Dufferin's Government. In spite of all the protests, and for the paltry sum of £35,000, they were to do this mischief, for there could not be any doubt whatever that mischief would follow, mischief of a character which was not appreciated by a good many members of the House. For the miserable and wretched sum of £35,000 they were asked to blacken the faces of the Government of India and to raise a spirit of disaffection amongst the Indian people. It appeared to him that this Vote, if passed would be passed rather from a desire not to embarrass the Government than from any feeling that the demand was a righteous one. He was very sorry that the Government, who was strong enough to have taken a righteous course, had not taken it. It was a disappointment to him that, having the opportunity of doing the right thing, they had failed to do it.

Sir W. Wedderburn.

Sir W. Wedderburn was sorry the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India had made this a question of confidence, and not left his supporters to vote freely. The good name of the House and the country was involved, and, therefore, the pressure of party discipline should not have been brought to bear on any member to vote either one way or the other. The question of finality was also involved, for no one could suppose that a party vote would dispose of the matter. He had the honour of serving on the Royal Commission which had to deal, amongst other things, with the apportionment of the charges between England and India, and he felt the labours of that Commission would be very much aided by such a free discussion of this question in the House as could take place if no pressure were employed. He regarded both parties as sinners in respect to their dealings with India, but if anything the Tories had the better record, and therefore it did not lay with the Liberals to call the Tory kettle black. There were five important precedents, of which three were bad; the cases of Abyssinia, of Egypt in 1882, and of the Sudan in 1885. These were cases in which the recommendations and protests of the Government of India were set aside by the Liberal Government. There were two good precedents, those of Malta and of Mombasa, and they were both made by a Conservative Government. It appeared to him it was not too late even now for the Government to allow the House a free hand in this matter. When the noble Lord decided to wait until the Government of India had an opportunity of putting forward their own view of the case, he thought the noble Lord was building a golden bridge for his own retreat. (Hear, hear.) Having already two good precedents, it would be well if he would make a third; and if the Government were not willing to change the recommendation they had made, they might, at all events, leave the responsibility of a decision to the free judgment of the House. There were two important declarations made by two Conservative Secretaries of State. In 1887, Lord Cross laid down the doctrine of the veto to be exercised by the Government of India; and again the present Secretary of State laid down on the 30th of June last, the excellent doctrine of reciprocity between India and England. The noble Lord's three rules must recommend themselves to all sides of the House; but on one point, perhaps, they did not come up to the full extent of reciprocity. His first proposition was that, when temporary and urgent need arose, assistance should be promptly given by either party; but the reciprocity stopped if the two conditions existed under the second and the third rules, for this reason that the objects for which an Indian contingent was required was generally temporary and emergent, whereas the objects for which British troops were required in India were of a more permanent kind. Therefore, in order to give the Indian people advantage from this reciprocity, we must make an allowance with regard to British troops serving in India, although they remained from year to year. If that point was conceded and complete reciprocity established between the two Governments everything would be settled on a fairly equitable basis, and it would then not be necessary to consider very carefully this difficult question of what were special interests because it would not matter much, for whatever the decision was it would apply equally to both parties. At present the Indian Government made enormous payments every year for British troops, not only for the use of them in India, but also for the transport and training of them. If an account was taken for the past it would be found, however much might be charged against India, there would be a large balance in her favour. The suppression of the Indian Mutiny was a matter specially affecting the welfare of England. British supremacy in India was vital to the British nation. Yet on the suppression of the Mutiny not a penny was paid by England and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

unfortunate India was saddled with a debt of about £46,000,000. It was said that India would be put to no additional expense, and would, therefore, lose nothing by the proposed arrangement; but allowance ought to be made for the effect of these requisitions on the military budget of India; it would be necessary to make provisions for the average annually required for such contingents. It might be that Indian troops were willing to serve in other parts of the world, but it must be remembered that Suakin was a very unhealthy place, and the liability of Indian troops to be sent to unhealthy climates made recruiting in India more costly and more difficult. Another point to be remembered was the difficulty the Viceroy would be placed in his own Legislative Council when he had to bring forward proposals for granting money for purposes regarded as illegitimate by the whole public opinion of India. What a position it was to put a Viceroy in to compel him, in the face of his own Despatch, to assure the Council that the payment could properly be passed by the representatives of the people of India. It had been pointed out that since 1892 a different complexion had been given to the Viceroy's Council, and that there were in the Council men who in a great measure did represent the people of India. The Viceroy himself, his Finance Minister, and the Military Member would have a bad quarter of an hour when they brought forward these proposals and, against their own declared convictions, proceeded to force them through by means of their mechanical majority. He earnestly urged the Government to reconsider their decision.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who, on rising, was received with Ministerial cheers, said: I think it my duty to trespass for a time on the attention of the House on this subject, but I shall be as brief as possible, because I am aware that there are several other members who are anxious to address the House. I will not attempt to follow the right hon. gentleman the member for Montrose, or the hon. member who spoke a little time ago, into the question of constitutional law, as to the power of the Government of the day to employ Indian troops without a previous Resolution to the House. It is the view of her Majesty's Government that there could be no ground for asking the House of Commons to come to a Resolution upon the subject unless it related to the question of the payment of the troops. (Hear, hear.) That matter may arise on another occasion; to-night, at any rate, it does not arise at all, although the right hon. gentleman opposite took up a very considerable period of time—(hear, hear)—in impressing the House with his views on the subject. We gave notice, as soon as we had arrived at the decision that India should have this charge, of our intention to propose the Resolution which has been proposed by my noble friend, and if that Resolution has been delayed for a month it has been delayed solely, as the House is aware, in deference to what I am quite sure is the universal desire of the House to be thoroughly acquainted with the views of the Government of India before arriving at a decision. (Ministerial cheers.) Therefore, Sir, in this case at any rate, there is no necessity whatever for me to go into the merits of a question of constitutional law, on which two such eminent persons as Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne hold diametrically opposite views. The right hon. gentleman the member for Montrose found some fault with my noble friend for devoting a very small portion of his speech to the past history of matters in the Sudan. He said that the question before us to-night was not whether the expedition which had been undertaken to Dongola was right or wrong or whether it was right or wrong to employ Indian troops in garrisoning Suakin; but when I listened to the speech of the right hon. gentleman I could not help thinking that he had largely pre-judged this question which is now before us, and that not a few hon. members on his side of the House have done the same, owing to their conviction—which, of course, they are perfectly entitled to hold—that our policy in Egypt, in sanctioning this expedition to Dongola, has been wrong, and that, therefore, they could not approve of any motion which should provide funds for purposes connected with that expedition, whether those funds were to be provided by England, by India, or by Egypt herself. (Hear, hear.) I will not attempt to argue that part of the question. Neither will I dwell upon the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman that this matter before us to-night is part of a policy on the part of her Majesty's Government to employ the army of India in unhallowed expeditions for the conquest of the habitable globe.

Mr. J. Morley: I beg pardon for interrupting the right hon. baronet, but I did not refer to her Majesty's Government in that respect; on the contrary, I desired to express my opinion that the apprehensions of the Government of India, which the noble lord had raised, that they might have to provide troops on a larger scale were not ill-founded. There was no attack on the Government.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer: I think the right hon. gentleman laid stress upon some suggestions of the Government of India that they might have a reasonable apprehension of some kind of policy of that sort on the part of her Majesty's Government, and the right hon. gentleman went on to quote some words, which have now become celebrated, of the Prime Minister, to the effect that we must not look upon India as an English barrack in the Oriental seas from which we may draw any number of troops without paying for them. Sir, those words were quoted with approval by the right hon. gentleman, they were cheered by his followers behind him, and I confess I was delighted to find that the wit and wisdom of the Prime Minister were for once properly appreciated on that side of the House. (Cheers.) I entirely agree, and every member of her Majesty's Government agrees in that sentiment of the Prime Minister's; it is as true now as it was when he uttered it. But there is nothing in what we are now proposing in any way contrary to that sentiment. (Hear, hear.) Addressing an audience in the country a little time ago, the right hon. gentleman said that if we passed such a motion as this we should admit that there is an unlimited reservoir of Indian forces which may be applied to unlimited and indefinite objects (Opposition cheers.) Nothing can be more definite as an object than the garrisoning of Suakin—the number of forces is strictly limited to 2,500, and the time even is limited to the close of the year. (Cheers.) Therefore, all these wild apprehensions of the right hon. gentleman are entirely beside the mark. What we have to decide to-night is an issue of importance—it is not merely a matter of £35,000, as the right hon. gentleman seems to think—(hear, hear)—it is an issue of importance, but it is a comparatively narrow one. It is whether, in the circumstances before us and in similar circumstances in the future, India shall do in the service of the Empire what India has done in the past. (Cheers.) I entirely agree with my noble friend the Secretary for India that the proposal which he has made to the House is a more favourable one to India than has ever been made before under similar circumstances. (Cheers.) He had proposed no more than was proposed in 1885, that India should bear the ordinary expenses of her troops which she would have had to bear if those troops had remained in India; but he had coupled with that proposition certain statements of opinion as to the policy to be pursued in future as between the Government of India and the Imperial Government which have met with the approval of the hon. baronet opposite who has just sat down, and which, I venture to say, will be considered by those who have taken up a strong line on this matter on behalf of India as far more favourable to them than any propositions that have ever yet been accepted by the Government of this country. (Hear, hear.) Let me recall the House for a few minutes to what occurred in this matter with regard to the Abyssinian expedition. It was proposed by the Government of the day that the ordinary pay of the large number of Indian troops employed in that expedition should continue to be borne by the Government of India. Mr. Gladstone was then in opposition, and Mr. Gladstone supported the proposal of the Government of the day. We probably entertain on opposition sides of the House different ideas of the political career of Mr. Gladstone, but no one has ever accused him of a want of consideration for weaker races or for India. But what did Mr. Gladstone say with regard to the employment of Indian troops in the Abyssinian expedition, in which we all admit now India had a very remote interest indeed? Mr. Gladstone on that occasion rather blamed the Government for being more liberal towards India than to England. Mr. Fawcett, who was opposing the Motion at the time, dwelt upon what he considered to be the injustice to India in making her pay this portion of the expenses of the campaign, whereas, on the other hand, she was compelled to pay the whole cost of English troops that were sent out to India. Mr. Gladstone, in his reply, almost ridiculed the idea that there was any

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

injustice to India in the matter. He dwelt at some length upon the question, and he repudiated the idea that any adequate return was made for the responsibility of the United Kingdom for the defence of India merely by the payment by India of the English troops that happened to be there at any given moment. He said:—"Our responsibility for the military government of India is not measured by the amount of English troops there. We are bound to keep in reserve a force adequate to meet all the contingent demands of India. Suppose India wants men—a soldier cannot be made in a day. But we are bound to keep up the stock of soldiers from which the wants of India can be supplied at a moment's notice. India again ceases to want men. Three, four, or five regiments are sent back, and the moment they come to England they become matter of charge against us. They do not come back because we want them, but because India does not want them." The right hon. gentleman summed up the whole position in these words:—"England must keep a military bank on which India can draw cheques at pleasure, and to which again, when it suits her, she may make remittances whether we have employment for them or not." Therefore, at that time, such an authority as Mr. Gladstone thought that there was no ground for this charge of injustice to India which is made against us to-day when we are asking India to continue to bear the ordinary pay of her troops which she has sent to the Sudan. (Hear, hear.) That was the language of Mr. Gladstone in 1867. With regard to what occurred in 1882 and 1885, let me in the first place name two points on which I think we are all agreed. I do not think that I have heard this evening any objection taken to the dispatch of Indian troops to the Sudan. (Hear, hear). Certainly no one connected with the Indian Council or with the Indian Government has raised it. The hon. member for Hackney, who objected to India being compelled to bear the cost of the pay of her troops employed in the Sudan, expressed his delight that they had been sent there, as it was a proof of the mutual relations which existed between England and India. (Hear, hear). Again, I think we are agreed upon the principle that where Indian interests are concerned, India ought to pay some of the costs of expeditions undertaken to protect those interests, even if those expeditions should be outside their own territories. (Hear, hear). But, of course, as the hon. member for Hackney remarked, the point is whether this expedition to the Sudan is undertaken in furtherance of the interests of India. (Hear, hear). Of course the Government of India has always disputed the position which has been taken up from time to time by the British Government on the question. Her Majesty's Government in England has always held that Egypt possesses a very material interest for India. The Indian Government in 1882 and 1885, and in the present year, have taken a different view of the matter. They have contended that Egyptian affairs were Imperial affairs, and that the great interest involved in the Suez Canal was an English rather than an Indian interest, and that even if it were an Indian interest in any degree, it was still more a colonial interest, and that, therefore, England was not justified in asking India alone to bear a portion of the cost of any Egyptian expedition. That, I think is the view of the right non. gentleman the member for Montrose, who told the meeting to which I have already alluded, that the interests of India and Egypt as corn and cotton-growing countries were antagonistic. I do not think that I have ever heard a more narrow view put forward. Let me turn to what was said on this subject by the right hon. gentleman who sits by his side—the right hon. member for Wolverhampton. The right hon. gentleman, when he had to deal with this matter as a member of the Government in 1883, when there was a proposal that India should bear not merely the ordinary pay of her troops employed, but 60 per cent. of the extraordinary expenses incurred by the large Indian force sent to assist in putting down the rebellion in Egypt, said—"It was perversity of intellect to resist the proposal that the Indian Exchequer should pay a very small sum towards the expenses of a war which he ventured to say was in the main, if not entirely, for the benefit of our Indian Empire."

Sir HENRY FOWLER said that he was not a member of the Government at the time to which the right hon. gentleman referred.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: If the right hon. gentleman was not a member of the Goverment at that time, I think that his words are entitled to even greater weight. (Hear, hear, and laughter). And then he went on to say that his opinion was that unless they had an Indian Empire to protect, no Government would have ventured to propose, and he was quite sure the country would never have sanctioned, a war in Egypt at all. (Cheers.) Well, sir, the right hon. gentleman the member for Montrose was perhaps ignorant of that expression of opinion on the part of his colleague. The right hon. gentleman found very severe fault with my noble friend the Secretary of State for India with regard to the eighth paragraph of his despatch. He characterised it as a spurious and insincere paragraph, because my noble friend put forward his views as to the interest which India has in the particular operations in which we are engaged. I admit that so far as these operations are concerned, the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton is not bound by what he said in 1883; but the right hon. gentleman the member for Montrose, a few weeks ago, challenged the opinion of this House on the policy of her Majesty's Government in undertaking these operations. That policy was fully discussed, and by a very large majority the House approved that policy as an essential part of the policy of the English Government in Egypt, in attempting to perfect and maintain the tranquillity of that country. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman has characterised the despatch of my right hon. friend as spurious and insincere.

Mr. J. MORLEY: That paragraph of it.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, that paragraph of it. May I refer him to the opinion of a gentleman in high position and authority, Sir Alexander Arbuthnot, a member of the Council of India, and, therefore, by no means disposed to consider the question in any other light than that of the interest of India. (Hear, hear.) He said: "The main argument used by Sir James Peile and Sir Donald Stewart is that India has, in their opinion, no direct or substantial interest in the operations now in progress in the Sudan. I altogether demur to this assertion. I hold that India has a very direct and substantial interest in the safety and tranquillity of Egypt, and in safeguarding that country from attack. The position of Egypt, lying, as it does, on the direct route from England to India, being, as it is, the highway by which our British troops have to travel to and from India, renders it as essential to the interests of India as it is to British interests that Egypt should be protected from her foes, and that her present peaceful and prosperous condition should be maintained. And, if it be, as I believe it is, requisite to this end that the supremacy of Egypt in the Sudan or in a portion of it should be re-established, then I submit that the success of any operations which have to be undertaken with this object is a matter which has a direct and substantial interest for India. The truth is"—and I agree in this—"that, if it were not for her Indian Empire, England would have no practical interest in Egypt." That is the opinion of the majority of the Indian Council, who are, at any rate, as entitled to decide a question of this nature as the Indian Government. My hon. friend behind has said: "Who ought to decide this question as to whether the interests of India are or are not involved in any particular matter?" No doubt it is right that we should attach importance to the views of the Indian Government on any such subject; but the authority to which Parliament has deliberately entrusted the right of agreeing to or refusing any Indian expenditure is the Council of the Secretary of State in London, and the Council of the Secretary of State, after having deliberately considered this question, have decided on the grounds I have quoted, by a large majority, that India may be fairly charged with this expenditure. (Hear, hear.) Now, what is the charge proposed? Is it that India should bear one single penny of taxation more than she does now? Not a bit of it. (Cheers.) What is proposed is that India should bear the ordinary pay of her troops, which she would have had to bear if they had remained in India. (Cheers.) We are told that that is not fair, because they are taken away from India and are serving somewhere else. But does India want them? Supposing that the £35,000 were paid over to India to-morrow, would India raise more troops? Certainly not. (Hear, hear.) That idea that we are depriving India of something that she requires is altogether wrong; because, if she had required it, the Government of India would not readily I may almost say voluntarily, have assented to those troops being sent to Suakin. All that India loses is this, that troops that would be in barracks in India are in barracks at Suakin. (Cheers.) It is said by some hon. members that this means

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

that we are charging India for our own advantage with a larger army than she would otherwise maintain. (Opposition cheers.) I hear a cheer at that, but is it really supposed that there is any army in the world, whether it be the English army, the Indian army, or even the American army, which is merely confined to the number of troops requisite for garrison duty? (Hear, hear.) Every army must include a considerable number of men which may be available for any unforeseen emergency. (Cheers.) The Indian Government having considered, of course, the requirements of India at the time, and not considering that these 2,500 men were likely to be required for any emergency, have readily allowed them to be sent to Suakin. How can it be urged that we are imposing on India any extra burden, or that we are compelling her to employ, owing to the temporary employment of these men at Suakin, a larger force than it would be otherwise necessary for her to keep up? (Hear, hear.) That is really the whole of this question. We are not asking the taxpayers of India to bear a single penny of additional taxation. We are asking them to utilize for the benefit of the Empire of which they form a part, for the service of the Empire to which they are proud to belong, their forces, which are only too anxious to be employed in the military duties of the Empire, without the cost of a penny to themselves; and we are do nothing in this but following the precedents set in the past. (Hear, hear.) Hon. members opposite have told us that there is a commission now sitting to enquire into the apportionment of the charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested. No doubt this, as well as matters of more permanent charge, must necessarily come under the consideration of that Commission. It may be that they may disapprove of the present rule. It may be that they may not be satisfied with the proposal of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the future, to which I, as representing the Treasury, have readily given my consent; but pending the consideration of this question, I say we are not entitled to give such authority as is claimed to the views of the Government of India. The Government of India are not an independent Government. The Government of India are entitled to hold an opinion and to express it; but what was said by Mr. Gladstone in the very debate I have already quoted with reference to the Government of Bombay? He said:—"The Governor is not a person acting on the part of a local legislature or on the part of a nation invested with privileges; he is a confidential servant of the Secretary of State, his representative and agent at Bombay." Great though their authority may be, I say that it is subordinate to that of the Secretary of State in Council, and to that of the Government of the Queen, and I protest against making any change, without the authority of the Commission, in the practice which has hitherto been pursued. I protest against placing the Government of India in a position of almost independent authority, to which position I contend they have no claim. (Cheers.)

SIR H. H. FOWLER.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The right hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that hon. members on this side of the House have prejudged the question because they think that the general policy of the Government in connection with the Sudan is wrong. I can assure the right hon. gentleman that I have not approached the consideration of this question in any such spirit. The question before the House is not as to the wisdom or folly of any policy that may be pursued in Egypt. The question is, as the right hon. gentleman most fairly stated, whether in the circumstances India shall do in the service of the Empire what she has done in the past. The right hon. gentleman admits that it is an issue of importance, but he says that it is comparatively narrow. I differ from him; I think the issue is much wider; I think that he himself, in his concluding remarks, which amounted, I would almost say, to a very serious attack upon the Government of India—(cheers)—has put the question on a much broader basis. I shall ask the House to consider, not whether India shall do in the future what she has done in the past, but whether India has not been compelled to do in the past what she ought not have been compelled to do, and whether this House will impose the same burden upon her in the future. The right hon. gentleman said that the despatch of the noble lord was very much in advance of anything that has been done in the past, but the determination of the Government is very retrograde as compared with what Lord Cross laid down 10 years ago, when he said that when Indian troops are employed on duties not directly attributable to the requirements of the Government of India and are dispatched to a country distant from India, no portion of the expenses of those troops could be charged to India without the full assent and concurrence of the Government of India. The issue now is whether we shall or shall not agree with the views of Lord Cross, whether we shall or shall not put this burden upon the taxpayers of India without the full assent and concurrence of the Government of that country? (Hear, hear). I think the right hon. gentleman was inaccurate when he said that Parliament had placed the control of the expenditure of the revenue of India in the hands of the Council of India. Undoubtedly it has done so as a general rule, but Parliament has reserved cases of this kind and with reference to them Parliament alone must decide.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: What I meant was this—the control of the expenditure is placed in the hands of the Council of India. If the Council had not agreed that India should bear this expenditure, no proposal of this kind could have been made to Parliament.

SIR H. FOWLER: Even if the Council had agreed, and if the Government of India had agreed, and it has not, the final and supreme tribunal is Parliament. There is one precedent to which attention has not been specially drawn to-night. It is the case of Perak, when the Abyssinian precedent was followed—namely that India should pay the ordinary charges and that the extraordinary charges should be borne by the Imperial Exchequer. The Indian Government objected, and quoted Lord Lawrence and Sir Willian Muir, great authorities. What did Lord Salisbury say on that occasion? He said that he recognised the soundness of the principle laid down in Lord Lawrence's minute. "But that, as it appeared to the Government that the expedition to Perak would be of brief duration, and would not involve the employment of troops from India for such a length of time as to give rise to any general inconvenience or danger, and in view of the interests which India might be said to have in a speedy termination of the war, it was right to agree to an arrangement similiar to that adopted in the case of the expedition to Abyssinia." But Lord Salisbury added:—"That this was not to be regarded as a precedent for any future case in which troops might be required from the Indian Establishment for Imperial purposes." But that is one of the very precedents which have been quoted to-night as precedents which we ought to follow, although Lord Salisbury distinctly stated that it should not form a precedent for future application. (Hear, hear). A great deal has been said to-night about Mombasa, and I should like to call attention to that case and the arguments which the Treasury employed respecting it, because there can be no doubt that the Policy now submitted to Parliament is the policy of the Treasury. I think the case of Mombasa is a very good illustration of the manner in which the Treasury has approached the whole question, and I would draw attention to the reason which I am bound to assume the right hon. gentleman himself gave or sanctioned for maintaining that India should bear the entire cost of sending Indian troops to Mombasa. "My Lords" gave as their first and principal reason that the trade with Zanzibar and Mombasa amounted to £335,000 of exports and £146,000 of imports, and they thought that India had such an interest in Mombasa and Zanzibar that she was justified in sending her troops, and paying for them, to put down the rebellion that had arisen there. The right hon. gentleman is generally very accurate in his quotations, and I have no doubt he verified those quotations about the trade with Zanzibar before he gave it the Treasury stamp of being a good reason for importing troops from India. But we cannot compare these figures in pounds, shillings, and pence. We must put them into tens of rupees. I put the trade with Zanzibar higher than the right hon. gentleman has put it, but I cannot make it amount to a million tens of rupees. But is the right hon. gentleman aware of the proportion that that bears to the whole trade of India? The imports and exports of India for the year with which the right hon. gentleman was dealing, and in regard to which he thinks a million tens of rupees is to justify this interference, is to form the connecting link between the interests of India and the Indian military expenses, were 185 millions of tens of rupees. I put it to the House whether it would matter one brass farthing to India if the trade of Zanzibar were to be swept out of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

existence? (Cheers.) The Treasury says that the trumpery interest of the 189th part of the whole trade in India is the justification of that interference. (Cheers.) I say that simply in passing, and I wish to come at once to the main principles involved in this question, and which are set forth with great clearness in the Despatch of the noble Lord. I I entirely agree with him as to his three principles. I think they are wise and statesmanlike, and I think they would be sound as future regulations in these Indian disputes. But I cannot assent to his application of the three principles that are to regulate the interference with the Indian troops to the reason which he gives with reference to free communication with Egypt by the shortest route. The object of the expedition has been fully dealt with to-night, and I will simply say, in one sentence, that this expedition is far more to serve Italian interests and Egyptian interests than Indian interests, and I would ask, is it just that the Indian taxpayer should be forced to find the money for the payment of the troops employed on the service of an ally of Great Britain? (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman who has just sat down seemed to be very much surprised that we should demur to the interests of India being involved in this operation. I have no recollection of what I said in 1883, but I have no doubt the right hon. gentleman quoted me accurately, and I only corrected him to say that at that time I was in a position of greater freedom and less responsibillty. (Ministerial laughter.) But I then held—and I hold now—that the justification of the whole military operations of 1882 was the Suez Canal; but if we follow Lord Salisbury's advice and look at a large map I do not think we shall find the interest of the Canal is in any way affected by the Sudan or the conquest of Khartum. Khartum has not been in the hands of Egypt for the last dozen years, and our communication with India has never been, I will not say imperilled, but has never been even in dispute. (Cheers.) I admit and I think that if a question arose with reference to the Suez Canal, India has a large, preponderating influence in it. So has Australia, so has New Zealand, so has Hong Kong, so has Ceylon, and so have all our settlements in the East. (Cheers.) But that question has not arisen in this case, though if it did I should be the last man to deny that India had an interest in it. But who is to be the judge as to whether India has this interest or not? I think Lord Cross gives the right answer when he says the Government of India. The hon. and learned gentleman opposite argued with great force in favour of that view. The right hon. gentleman denies that, and says it should be the Council at home. We say here to-night, whatever may be the view of the Government of India or the view of the Council at home, it must be Parliament, who must ultimately decide this question. (Cheers.) I will state as shortly as possible why I think Parliament should decide this question in favour of India. My first reason is that the revenues of India pay the whole cost of the Indian army. They pay the cost of recruiting and they pay the cost of training, and, when you say you are paying the cost of the troops, let me say that the daily pay of these troops is a very small part of what they cost. (Cheers.) No one knows better than the Chancellor of the Exchequer that that is not the rule which is applied with reference to the employment of British troops in India. India pays for every British soldier that is sent there—every shilling which that soldier has cost from the moment of his enlistment to the day of his death, including his pension. (Ministerial cries of "No.")

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON: Embarkation.

Sir H. FOWLER: Yes; embarkation. (Ministerial laughter and cheers.) But what I mean is that the capitation fee of £7 10s., which is additional to pay, covers the whole of those extra charges—the capitation fee, which is now the subject of investigation by a Royal Commission, and which is alleged by the Treasury not fully to cover, and by the Indian Government to more than cover, the entire cost.

Sir J. FERGUSSON: As the right hon. gentleman has been good enough to notice my interruption, perhaps he will allow me to ask him—Does he mean to say that the Indian Government pays for the cost of the soldiers in a link battalion serving at home?

Sir H. FOWLER: I mean to say that what India pays as a capitation fee, in addition to other charges, is £7 10s. or £8 a head for every British soldier that is employed in the Indian service—£7 10s. or £8 per head per annum, and that that sum includes the cost to which I refer. Another reason is this. You have intrusted the administration of India to a Viceroy and Council practically chosen by ourselves. They are the Constitutional Guardians of the revenue of India, and except in some supreme necessity involving the very existence of the Empire, we have no right to apply these revenues for any other than Indian purposes. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman says this is a loan. But there is a lender as well as a borrower. We are the borrowers, and we dictate the terms of the loan, and India has no voice in saying whether she is willing to lend on these terms. (Hear, hear.) Again, I say there is no reciprocity. The charges upon India in respect of English soldiers going to India are not put upon the same basis as the cost to India of troops coming out of India. "England" (said Lord Lawrence) "paid no portion of the heavy expenditure of the mutiny. All the troops and the materials which were sent from England to aid in putting down the mutiny were paid for out of the revenue of India. It was never urged because this measure afforded temporary relief to the British exchequer that a portion of the ordinary cost of these troops should be paid by England." Lord Northbrook, a great Viceroy, said in the House of Lords speaking of the Abyssinian expedition: "The whole of the ordinary expenses were paid by India, the argument used being that India would have to pay her troops in the ordinary way, and she ought not to seek to make a profit. How did the Home Government treat the Indian Government when troops were sent out to the Mutiny? Did they say, 'We do not want to make a profit?' Not a bit. Every single man sent out was paid by India during the whole time—though only a temporary use was made of them—including the cost of drilling and and training as recruits until they were sent out." If this principle was to be applied in sending out troops to India, surely it ought also to be applied when Indian troops were sent on Imperial expeditions. (Cheers.) I will quote a still higher authority—Lord Salisbury:—"The special injustice of the course now about to be pursued consists in this, that when we employ English troops on Indian duty they are paid for out of the Indian revenues from the moment that they land in the country, but when we employ Indian troops on Imperial duty we say that India must pay for them." (Hear, hear.) Is the army of India to be regarded as a reserve? Some gentlemen hold the view that, as we have great Asiatic and Eastern interests, the Indian army is to be regarded as a reserve from which both the Imperial and the Indian Government can draw. If that is so, the Imperial funds should pay some proportion of forming it. If it is to be an army of reserve, and we are to draw upon it in aid of any of our requirements, we ought to pay our share of forming it, recruiting, training, and all the other ordinary expenditure of the Indian Army. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman was rather impatient of the allegation as to the army of India being too large or too small, as the argument is put. If it is too large we ought to reduce it; if it is too small it cannot be depleted. All I can say is this—I think the noble lord knows better than I do that successive viceroys, commanders-in-chief, and India councils have maintained during a long succession of years that the army was only sufficiently large for Indian purposes, and that it would not be safe to make any reductions. When the right hon. gentleman spoke just now of the readiness with which the Indian Government lent these troops, the eagerness with which they afforded evidence that the troops could be spared, I think he had forgotten one paragraph of the despatch which I will read—"We would point out that her Majesty's Government add to our responsibilities by calling upon us to furnish Indian troops for service at an unhealthy station like Suakin, in the worst season of the year in order to avoid the risk involved in sending troops for the purpose from England; during the absence of those troops we have to govern India with an army smaller than our needs impose upon us, and we cannot too strongly urge, therefore, that, whilst our responsibilities are thus increased, India should not at the same time be called upon to pay for troops not available for Indian needs." (Hear, hear.) That difficulty, therefore, Sir, was clearly present to the mind of the Indian Government. Another point I would make is this. In the arrangement of ordinary and extraordinry charges, the Imperial Government lays down the principle and the Imperial Government is the sole judge of its application. (Hear, hear.) In finance we must remember another point—namely, that the Exchequer which make this demand is the rich Exchequer, and the Exchequer from whom the demand is made is the poor Exchequer. (Hear, hear.) Look at the con-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

trast. And I think the Indian people will look at the contrast. (Hear, hear.) Not very many members of this House heard the singularly able and lucid speech of the only hon. member of the House who is emphatically a native and resident in India, and who contended with great force against the injustice of imposing any charge whatever of this description upon the poverty of India. When the Indian people read the speech which the Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered in this House three or four months ago they will see that he announced that the realised surplus of the last year upwards of £4,250,000; that he was able to state that the taxation of 100 millions which he was proposing would involve no pressure upon the people of this country; that he declared that, with our Sinking Fund, we had a reserve fund equivalent to something like £200,000,000 sterling—and this is the rich Exchequer which is putting the pressure upon a poor Exchequer which has developed its own country entirely at its own cost, where the sources of taxation are limited, and the tax which every man, woman, and child pays—the tax on salt—is already at a war limit, has been recently raised, and ought to be reduced! This is a question which the House of Commons, in dealing with the matter as it must do, not on narrow, but broad Imperial grounds, cannot ignore. And for what a paltry sum! I do not believe in the £35,000. I believe it will be more. I know that Estimates always increase in Government Departments. It would suit my argument better if it were £35,000. I believe £60,000 or £70,000 will be nearer. But even if it should be £35,000 is it wise or statemanlike to defy the public opinion of the people of India, to commit the Imperial Government to a course which, as has been stated by high authority, "the whole Native and European Press condemn as impolitic, as dangerous and unjust?" Is it wise or statesmanlike to overrule the unanimous opinion of the Government of India on a question on which they say "public opinion in India is practically unanimous?" That Government—of which I am sorry the right hon. gentleman spoke as he did to-night—is our creation. We have decreed its constitution and composition. We have confided to it the government of the millions of India; and remember they regard it as the embodiment of the Imperial rule under which they live. It represents to them the Sovereign and the Parliament and that Government, in no hesitating or doubtful language, approves of their protest against the course now pursued. We are told that the proposal before the House is in accordance with precedent. The noble lord in his last despatch says it is impossible to controvert the logical conclusion at which he has arrived from the premisses he has laid down. Although I believe the precedents do not justify his action, although I believe that his premisses are unsound, and his conclusion is fallacious, I am quite willing to waive that belief, to admit his premisses and accept his logic, and in doing so I think I shall put my case on a different and a higher plane. The precedents of 1882 and 1885 have been quoted. A bad precedent does not demand, much less justify, its repetition. The Government which was responsible for the decisions of 1882 and 1885 was not infallible. (Hear, hear). The Parliament of 1895 is quite as competent—and I think on many grounds much more—as the Parliament of 1880 to create a precedent. We are not bound as a House of Commons—I say it openly, frankly, and fairly—in dealing with a question of this sort, where there has been no distinct, uniform precedent laid down, where the precedents have differed as widely as the cases have differed—we are not bound to follow an isolated precedent. I believe the decision of the House in 1882 aroused the strongest feeling of disapproval in India. And if for the moment I admit that the precedents and premisses of the noble lord logically lead to the conclusion at which he has arrived, my answer is the reply which his greatest leader once gave in this House when taunted with logical inconsistency on some political question. Mr. Disraeli, in one of those epigrammatical sentences in which he was wont to crystallise his experience of our Constitutional system, said "England is not governed by logic; England is governed by Parliament." (Hear, hear, and cheers). And it is the essence of Government by Parliament that Parliament can, does, and must recognise that national sentiment which we call public opinion, even if that national sentiment seems to conflict with something which may have been done in similar circumstances. No student of history can ignore the great part which national sentiment has played in human affairs, and every English Government, whether the strongest English Government or the weakest, not only carefully watches the growth and spread of public opinion at home, but eagerly scans the growth and tendency of public opinion in our colonies, whether self-governing or under the control of the Crown. Our colonial blunders in former days were the results of high-handed action in Downing Street, disregarding the views, the opinions, and, if you like, the prejudices of our fellow colonial subjects. Why, if you watch colonial sentiment, if you regard colonial public opinion, are you not to regard the sentiment of India? (Cheers.) Are we to listen eagerly to every expression of popular opinion in Canada on Canadian affairs, in Australia on Australian affairs, in South Africa on South African affairs—(cheers)—and shut our ears to the public opinion of India? (Cheers.) It may be said that this is a question of money. No, it is not a question of money. We cannot conduct and adjust our varied, our delicate relationships with our greatest dependency on the huckstering principle of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market. The first Secretary of State for India summed up in a sentence the spirit which should guide the attitude of the British Government to India in all the circumstances which that union would necessarily involve. "India," said Lord Derby, "is a great glory, a great responsibility, a great danger; a great glory if we studiously do our duty, a great responsibility"—I would ask the House to mark these words—"and, therefore, every member of Parliament should be as anxious to protect the interests of India as to protect the interests of his own constituents"—(cheers)—"a great danger, and, therefore, any injustice done to India may return to us with fearful retribution." I think that wise, that statesmanlike sentence should not only be emblazoned in the Council Chamber of Calcutta and Whitehall, but should regulate every vote which this House gives on a question affecting India. The issue of this Division is no party squabble; it involves no election pledges—(cheers)—it recalls no political programmes. Parliament in its Imperial capacity is called upon to discharge an Imperial duty, as my right hon. friend said, to perform a judicial act. Let us discharge that Imperial duty and give that decision in an Imperial spirit worthy of the great people in whose name and by whose authority we act. (Cheers.) We are not asked to-night to adjust some trumpery balance of account between the Exchequer of Great Britain and the Exchequer of India. We are asked to reverse, to override in our own interest the opinion of the people of India constitutionally embodied in the unanimous decision of the Viceroy and his Council, to whom we have confided the Government of India. At whose instance are we asked to take this step? I venture to say, not at the instance of the constituences that sent us here. (Cheers.) I honestly believe that the overwhelming preponderence of public opinion in this country is at this moment on the side of India. (Cheers.) In this House only one solitary member has spoken on the other side in favour of the course which the Government are taking; but men who have spent their lives in India—the one Conservative member who is himself an Indian has spoken—men of all parties, men inside politics and men outside, men who know India, men who are jealous of the honour of Great Britain, the organs in the press of Conservative, Liberal Unionist, and Radical, are at one in their utterance on this question. The people of England know that we have the power to do what is wrong? I cling to the belief, the well founded belief, that their desire is that we should have the courage to do what is right. (Cheers.) This House has a rare—I might say almost a priceless—opportunity of frankly recognising and ungrudgingly accepting the decision of the Indian Government on an Indian question, in which the Government and the people of India feel that the interests of India are in danger. Such a frank recognition, such a self-denying acceptance will quicken the growth of those feelings of mutual confidence, of mutual sympathy, of mutual good will, which will rivet India to Great Britain by ties stronger than the power of our Army, and more enduring than the splendour of our administration. (Loud cheers.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. Balfour): In the short time that remains to us before the House comes to a decision upon this question I shall not attempt to survey the whole field of debate which has taken place to-night. Much has been said upon legal and constitutional issues. Much also

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

has been said upon the course taken by the Government in regard to the troops sent to Mombasa. But I am sure that I shall be consulting the wishes of the House if I brush aside both those topics, interesting and important though they doubtless are, and if I come at once to what I believe to be the kernal and the central proposition of the opposition to the proposal which the Government has laid before the House. One other topic there is, indeed, upon which I would gladly have said a word if the opportunity had suited. I should have asked the House to consider whether the time has not arrived when we might, with advantage both to India and to England, constitute some kind of tribunal of arbitration—if I may use the phrase—for the determining of questions of this sort—(Hear, hear)—some tribunal in which the interests of India and Great Britain should be alike and equally represented; which might have authority in India and might have authority in this country—an authority which, perhaps, neither the expressions of the Indian Government, speaking for India, nor the expressions of the British Government, speaking, as they endeavour to do, not for Great Britain alone, but for the whole Empire - (Hear, hear) - do not always carry with them. (Cheers.) But those are subjects too long for treatment to-night, and I shall go at once to the dominant consideration, which will, I believe, much influence the voting in the Lobby, and shall give upon that central principle the views of her Majesty's Government, so far as I am confident to express them. What is the real argument which, adorned and expanded and decked out as it may be by other arguments and by historical illustrations, lies really at the root of the opposition to the Resolution moved by my noble friend? In one word, it is believed—erroneously, I think - by those who oppose this Motion that the action of the British Government is a mean action. (Opposition cheers). Those who oppose the Motion think we are using our power as a dominant partner in this association with India to squeeze out of India money which India does not owe us. (Opposition cheers). But if I shared those views, and if my colleagues shared those views, I need not tell the House we should be the last people in the world to bring forward a Resolution of this kind. (Cheers). I may perhaps be assisted in my argument if I remind the House of a topic used against us in the Debate, but which really ought to appeal to impartial minds in our favour. We have been told that the sum at stake is a trifling sum. So it is. It is not even certain, or even probable, that that sum, trifling as it is, will be paid by the British Exchequer. But that has been used by hon. gentlemen opposite as proof of the extraordinary pettifogging and huckstering meanness of this Government. Surely it shows that in the course we have been pursuing we have not been animated by those natural motives which have influenced British Governments of relieving the British taxpayer of some burden and of relieving the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the necessity of finding new resources, but that we have been animated, and animated alone, by a sincere belief that the principle which is embodied in this Resolution is not only wholesome for England but wholesome for India also, and wholesome, above all for the Empire of which India and Great Britain are the largest constituencies. (Cheers.) It is admitted, as I am glad to see, by hon. gentlemen who have spoken against this Resolution, that her Majesty's present advisers have made great changes, and beneficial changes, in the financial relations between this country and India. (Hear, hear.) It is admitted by speakers on both sides of the House, who view with suspicion and even with resolute opposition the policy we are pursuing, that at all events that policy is not the policy, in all its details, which has been pursued up to this time; but that we have made great and beneficial changes in the interests of India in the policy which we have now adopted. (Hear, hear). Everybody has accepted the three principles laid down by my noble friend. But my noble friend has done more than laid down principles acceptable to all classes of opinion in this House. He and the Government of which he is a member have for the first time taken care that the views of the Government of India shall be laid before this House and be considered by this House before the House comes to a decision. (Cheers). That is the first change. The second is that he has laid it down that when either India is called upon by Great Britain or Great Britain is called upon by India to lend troops for any particular service, if the time for which those troops are lent shall exceed the very brief period of six or seven months, the whole cost, and not merely the extraordinary cost, shall be borne by the part of the Empire which is making the claim on the other part of the Empire. (Cheers.) And he has laid it down in the third place that there shall in the future be reciprocity in this matter between Great Britain and India; and if, in addition to the ordinary British army in India, there should, for any Indian purpose, be a temporary loan required from Great Britain, that loan shall be dealt with in precisely the same way and on the same principles as a loan which Great Britain may ask from the Empire of India. These are great changes. (Cheers.) They are changes entirely in the interests of India. They are changes entirely in the interests of absolute justice as between the two countries. And when I look back to the long series of precedents on this subject; and when I remember that in 1867 Mr. Gladstone said that the arrangements made by the then Conservative Government were too favourable to India—(hear, hear)—when I remember that in 1882, not only the whole of the ordinary cost, but the whole of the extraordinary cost, was thrown upon India, and that by a tardy and imperfect act of justice some small fraction of the extraordinary cost was afterwards paid back; when I remember that in 1885 Mr. Gladstone for the third time gave emphatic recognition to this rule without any of the limitations which we imposed upon it; and when I remember that almost every hon. gentleman opposite who then had a seat in the House, either by speech or vote, or by speech and vote, endorsed these principles—(cheers)—when I remember all that—I confess I am astounded at the air of disinterested virtue—(loud cheers)—with which they now come forward and, not cantent with all that we have done to put these financial relations upon a sound and equitable basis, accuse us of sacrificing, forsooth, the interests of India to those of England? (Cheers.) We have not gone half the length that they went. (Cheers.) We are all agreed that the policy of my noble friend is an enormous improvement on the policy of any of his predecessors, from whichever side they have been drawn. There is another principle quite removed, I am glad to think, from party politics, and the discussions as to who said what, when and how, and whether his vote and speech now was consistent with his vote and speech ten years ago. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) There is another principle of far deeper application on which every man in this House will be glad to agree. We are all of opinion that whatever justice dictates in this matter should be done. (Hear, hear.) We are all agreed that for us, the stronger Power, to put upon the shoulders of the weaker Power any portion of the burdens of the Empire which it is our business to bear, would be an act of public wickedness and infamy—(cheers) - and the question, therefore, only remains to determine whether or not the Resolution of my noble friend and the policy which that Resolution embodies does or does not violate the rules and principles on which every man in this House, to whatever party he belongs, is glad cordially to subscribe his assent. But let me remind the House that the particular proposition which, amid general assent, my noble friend has laid down for the practical division of the burden in this case as between England and India is merely a practical rule, and must rest upon deeper principles—principles perhaps not capable of mathematical or logical expression, but the general scope and bearing of which every man can understand. I assume that England and India are parts of one Empire having common interests, common objects, and therefore animated by common motives and a common policy. (Hear, hear.) I assent, of course, at once to the proposition that there are matters in which the direct interest of India is so remote that it almost vanishes, as there are Indian questions in which the direct interest of England is so remote that it likewise almost vanishes, and becomes what mathematicians call a negligible quantity. But consider those great Imperial questions on which no man can say that the interest of India is a vanishing quantity. Let me remind the House in this connection that the foreign and military policy of Great Britain has for many generations been largely influenced by Indian considerations. (Cheers.) And yet I am not aware that India has ever contributed, or has ever been asked to contribute, to that diplomatic machinery which has been largely used on her behalf. (Cheers.) I apprehend that the Crimean War—whether you think it good or bad, just or unjust, and I am not going to pay a compliment to that war, or rather to the authors of it—(laughter)—was largely an Indian war, was largely dictated by considerations of Indian policy. (Hear, hear.) Towards that war India never contributed a sixpence. The right hon. gentleman first told us that, so far as the Army is concerned, India pays every penny which is required for the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

soldiers which India uses. But India, so far as I am aware, contributes not one sixpence to that great Reserve which we have accumulated, not for the needs of this country alone, but for the needs of any part of the British Empire, and notably for the needs of India. (Cheers.) That line of argument, important as regards the Army, gains double strength when we refer to the Navy. (Hear, hear.) The cost of the British Navy is 20 millions a year, and the contribution of India to that Imperial Navy is £100,000 annually. (Hear, hear.) It has been said that India would have to keep up a navy if she was not already protected by the Navy of England. (Hear, hear.) Is there any man who can suppose that, if England and India were divorced one from another, India could maintain a navy adequate to protect her shores from invasion for £100,000, or for ten times or 20 times £100,000 a year? (Cheers.) Let the House remember what is the position of India, and what it is acknowledged to be by right hon. gentlemen opposite. India depends upon England as its base, and the communications between England and India are absolutely vital to the existence of the Indian Empire. A defeat of the Indian Army on the Indus would be a trifling disaster for India compared with a defeat of the British fleet in the Channel, and the day which sees our military communication with India through the fleet severed, will be the last day of the Indo-British Empire. (Hear, hear.) Who pays the cost of this communication? What would you say of a general who said the whole cost of his Army was to be limited, or qualified or determined by the amount paid for the soldiers engaged in active operations in the front, ignoring the incomparably more important course of keeping open communications with his base? That general would be regarded as either a very poor arithmetician or a very bad strategist. (Hear, hear.) The truth is that, if you sum up all that is now done, and done without complaint, by this country for the common Empire, in the way of diplomacy, in the way of military reserve, and in the way of our fleet, I think you will find that, if a strict account was drawn between the Indian Empire and the British Government, a large amount of arrears was due from India to the British Exchequer. But, Sir, though this consideration ought not to be lost sight of, we are the last people to suggest that in this partnership the heaviest burden should be thrown upon India. All we say is that in establishing a rule of this kind it must in fairness be remembered that the rule is one most favourable to India, and that Great Britain is the partner which suffers most pecuniary loss. The right hon. gentleman laid down the methods by which my noble friend's principle rule is to be applied. My noble friend laid it down as a practical rule governing the relations of the Exchequer that, where Indian interests are not concerned in an obvious and direct manner, India should not be asked to pay. "Who is to be the judge of that?" asks the right hon. gentleman. He then says, quoting from a Despatch of Lord Cross, that the Indian Government are to be the judges in the matter. (Sir H. FOWLER: It should at least be with their assent.) When did the right hon. gentleman invent this principle? He borrowed it from Lord Cross, but what a pity it is that he did not read Lord Cross's Despatch when in office. (Cheers.) I distinctly remember that one of the first things the present Government had to do when they came into office was to review a decision of the right hon. gentleman opposite with regard to Chitral. (Cheers.) And what was that decision? It was a decision overruling the unanimous opinion of the whole Indian Government without exception. (Cheers.) I am bound to say I think the Indian Government are much better judges of the policy to be pursued in Chitral than they are of the larger and more Imperial question which we are discussing now; and if they are to be overruled by the sole authority of the Secretary of State for India with regard to a purely Indian matter like Chitral, surely they must not be regarded as having the verdict without appeal upon a question in which England and the Empire at large are at least as much interested or more interested than they are themselves. (Cheers.) The time is growing short, and I must compress my arguments into the closest compass of which they are susceptible. I will only therefore say, as regards the contention that India is not interested in the operations now going on in Egypt, that at all events the Unionist Party and the House have committed themselves by immense majorities to the proposition that the present expedition is in the interest of Egypt, and will have excellent effects upon the interests of Egypt; and all we ask is that the natural conclusion shall be drawn from that—namely, that what is obviously for the benefit and the security of Egypt should not be regarded now as it had never been regarded in the past, as outside the purview of Indian statesmen. The relations between England, Egypt and India have been matters of consideration to the statesmen of both England and India for more than a century—(cheers)—and never yet has it been suggested that the good order and good government in Egypt, and the international relations which depend upon good order and good government in Egypt, are not matters partly of Indian concern. Therefore we are brought directly to the question of what is the sacrifice which India is asked to make on behalf of this Indian interest. I do not mean to discuss the pecuniary interest at great length, but one word I must say. Thought it is impertinent of me to attack eminent men and high authorities on this subject, I am bound to say that greater nonsense appears to me to have been talked both in and out of this House, both in and out of some public despatches upon the subject of the drain on Indian military resources than on almost any subject which I can recall to mind. One of my hon. friends who spoke on this point is intimately acquainted with City affairs, and I am quite sure he spoke excellent sense from a City point of view—(laughter)—but let it be remembered that you cannot draw a parallel of this kind between an army reserve and a banker's reserve. About 1 per cent. of the Indian army is being taken for six months. Any Indian necessity within that time would of course require the transport of the army back to India, and the transport of the army back to India is quite as rapid an operation as the transport of the army within India from one end to the other. This army is still available for Indian purposes if India requires it, and there is no suggestion either that England should borrow from India or that India should borrow from England under any circumstances whatsoever troops which in any human probability will be required for the internal necessities of one part of the Empire or of the other. Everybody knows that the strength of the army, be it the Indian, or the English, or the French, or the German army, is absolutely unnecessary year after year—decade after decade I had almost said—in time of peace. What it has to be kept for are those happily rare cataclysms to which every national nerve is strained to the utmost and all national resources drawn upon to the full. This is not such a period in India any more than it is such a period in this country, and one part of the Empire surely has a right, if it can do so without injury to the other part, to ask it to lend for a few brief months at most, without loss to itself, for which by hypothesis it can have no possible use. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman has told us that the effect of this resolution if carried, as I earnestly hope it will be—(cheers)—will be disastrous to our position and to our prestige in India. I cannot agree with that. I hold precisely the opposite opinion. If India was an estate which this country was going to exploit for its own advantage, if we regarded India merely from the point of view of national vanity or national profit, it might be said:—"You get your profit, your vanity is satisfied; it is not for you to ask even the imaginary sacrifice—for imaginary it is—which this Resolution imposes upon the the Indian people." But I should be sorry to think that such a view of the relations of these two integral parts of the Empire should become fashionable either in Britain or in India. I regard them as two elements in one great whole whose interests cannot be divorced, each of which must suffer with the sufferings of the other each of which must gain in the gain of the other, and which cannot look on with indifference on any of the needs or any of the policy which either one party or the other is obliged to pursue. (Cheers.) To tell the Indian Government that while we preserve in part for them—I do not put it higher than that—diplomatic, military, and naval establishments, while we keep open lines of communication, whether they be by the Suez Canal, Aden, or the Cape of Good Hope, and pay the cost thereof—to tell them that when some question arises in which they and we are interested, it may be in different degrees, but still alike interested, they are not to make a sacrifice, not even to make the imaginary sacrifice which they are called upon to make by this Resolution, is to breed ideas as to the true relations of this country which must ultimately end in their separation. (Cheers.) This sum of £35,000, whosoever pays it—whether it be England, Egypt, or India—is an absolutely insignificant item in the national account; but, Sir, if this House decides

CC-0. Mumukshu Bhawan Varanasi Collection. Digitized by eGangotri

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

that India is so little a part of, has so slight a connection with, this Empire, is drawn to us by bonds so slender and so insignificant, that even under the terms proposed by my noble friend, they cannot send 2,000 men to Suakin, then, Sir, I say you are educating, not merely the British public, but the Indian public in absolutely false notions—(cheers)—of what we all owe to a common Empire, and it is in the name, not merely of England, not merely of India, but in the name of that common Empire itself, that I ask the House to assent to this Resolution. (Loud cheers.)

The House then divided on Morley's amendment, when the voting was:—

For the Amendment	190
Against	275
Majority against	85

The announcement of the figures was received with loud Opposition cheers.

A divisi n being challenged on the main question, the House again divided, when the voting was:—

For Lord G. Hamilton's motion	252
Against	106
Majority for the motion	146

The announcement of the figures was received with Ministerial cheers.

July 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN TROOPS IN AFRICA.

Expenses of Indian troops in Africa.—Petition from London, against imposition on the revenues of India; to lie upon the Table.

July 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

KYTHAL STATE.—PETITION.

State of Kythal.—Petition from Cis Sutlej, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

WAZIRI AND CHITRAL MEDALS.

Colonel WYNDHAM MURRAY asked the Under Secretary of State for War, when the medal for the relief of Chitral would be issued to the troops engaged.

Dr. FARQUHARSON asked the Under Secretary of State for War, when the medals for the Waziri and Chitral campaigns would be issued.

Mr. BRODRICK: It has been decided to strike a new medal for frontier services, the first clasp of which will be given for the Chitral campaign. The design is now awaiting final approval, and the dies will shortly be sent out to India, where the medals will be struck. The medals for the Waziri campaign have been issued.

July 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE NURSING STAFF AT ADEN.

Mr. MOON asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India was prepared to provide or contribute to the providing of a trained nursing staff in the hospitals at Aden, or in anyone of the hospitals there.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A reference was made to the Government of India on the 9th April last, relative to the nursing staff at Aden, but I have not yet received a reply. The Government of India will be asked to expedite their report.

July 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A MEDAL REFUSED.

Captain GRICE-HUTCHINSON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of the fact that a decoration was issued to the troops employed in the late Ashanti expedition, he would reconsider the decision arrived at to withhold a medal from the British and Indian troops who served in the operations in Burma and the Chin Hills in 1892-93.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: After fully considering the question I can see no reason for modifying the decision arrived at in 1894 not to grant the India medal to the troops who served in the operations in Burma and the Chin Hills in 1892-93 and to that decision I must adhere.

July 16th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

A "MASTERPIECE OF MELANCHOLY MEANNESS."

THE PEERS AS "LITTLE ENGLANDERS."

THE RESOLUTION APPROVED.

The UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (The Earl of Onslow) rose to move—"That her Majesty having directed a military expedition of her Native forces charged upon the revenues of India to be despatched to Africa in aid of the Egyptian troops, this House consents that the ordinary pay of any troops so despatched, as well as the ordinary charges of any vessels belonging to the Government of India that may be employed in this expedition, which would have been charged upon the resources of India if such troops or vessels had remained in that country or seas adjacent, shall continue to be so chargeable; provided that if it shall become necessary to replace the troops or vessels so withdrawn by other vessels or native forces, then the expense of raising, maintaining, and providing such vessels and forces shall, in so far as may not be otherwise provided, be repaid out of any moneys which may be provided by Parliament for the purpose of the said expedition." His lordship said that the terms of the motion to which he asked their lordships' assent informed them that her Majesty had directed a military expedition of her Native forces charged on the revenues of India to be despatched to Africa. That expedition consisted of the 1st Bombay Lancers, the 26th Regiment of Infantry from the Punjab, the 35th Bombay Infantry, the 5th Bombay Mountain Battery, and a company of Madras Sappers and Miners. The troops, therefore, had been taken from all parts of India, and had been selected from among the most efficient portion of the Indian Army. They had done good service either in Abyssinia or in Afghanistan, and were commanded by General Egerton, an officer of great experience. He had to ask their lordships' assent to the Resolution, because an Act was passed in 1858 for the better government of India, in which there was a clause to the effect that except for preventing or repelling actual invasion in India, or under circumstances of urgent necessity, the revenues of India should not, without the consent of Parliament, be applied to defray the expenses of any military expedition beyond the frontiers of India. The history of that clause was that when the Bill was passed through the other House of Parliament a clause was proposed by Mr. Gladstone to the effect that, unless the consent of Parliament was given, for the purposes of war the Indian forces of her Majesty charged on the Indian revenues should not be employed in any operation beyond the external frontier, and when that Bill came up to their lordships' House an Amendment was moved by the late Lord Derby, who was Prime Minister at the time, and who thought it necessary to apply a financial check to such an exercise of power. The effect of the clause, therefore, as it stood, was that the consent of Parliament was required, not before the Indian Army could be employed beyond the frontier, but before the revenues of India could be applied in the payment of such an expedition. A Resolution similar to the one he had placed before their lordships had been passed by the other House, and it was not by any means the first time that such a Resolution had been brought before Parliament. As a general rule, the circumstances under which those expeditions had been conducted were precisely the same as in the present case—that was to say, that the revenues of India bore the ordinary charges of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

expedition and the revenues of Great Britain the extraordinary charges. The only exceptions to that were in two very important and unusual cases. One was at the time when India was prostrated after a great internal struggle, and the other was when the troops were required for purely European purposes, and upon those two occasions no part of the expenses was charged on the revenues of India. But, as he had already said, the usual practice had been to adopt the plan of the Resolution he had submitted. He would recount the several occasions upon which expeditions of Indian troops had been sent out of India. The first occasion was in 1839, when an expedition was sent to China. That was in the days of the East India Company, whose duty it was to be regardful of the pockets of their shareholders, and when India was under the control of that company. It was suggested at that time that the revenues of India should bear no part of the expense, but the East India Company recognised that it was unreasonable that they should be paid for hiring out troops, and, in consequence, it was ultimately decided that the cost should be shared in the same proportion as was now proposed. In the case of the expedition to Persia the expenses were shared in the same proportion as was now proposed. At the time of the expeditions to China, in 1858 and 1859, the resources of India had just been tried to the utmost by the mutiny, and it was not thought possible or desirable or right to impose any part of the charges of those expeditions upon the revenues of India. In the case of the Abyssinian War, India bore the ordinary charges and England the extraordinary charges of the Indian troops; in the case of the expedition to Perak, the charges were divided equally between the two countries. The expedition to Malta in 1878 was another of the exceptional cases to which he had referred. Nobody at that time contended that the bringing of troops from India to Malta was very considerably in the interests of India, and, therefore, no burden was placed on the finances of India in respect to the bringing of the troops to Malta. Then came the two cases of expeditions to Egypt. The first was in the year 1882, when Arabi Pasha was threatening our communications with the East. It was proposed at the time that, inasmuch as the interests of India were manifestly affected by what was going on, the whole of the charges should be placed on her resources; but it was subsequently decided by Parliament that India should bear 60 per cent. and England 40 per cent. of the expenses. The second expedition was in 1885, when there were, as now, troubles in the Sudan. There was one satisfactory feature about the present controversy, and it was that it had never been suggested that it was not right or proper India should be called upon to furnish some part of her troops. The Government and people of India recognised that the Indian Army was a part of her Majesty's Army—(Hear, hear)—and they responded with alacrity to the call for troops. While he rejoiced that this was so, he could not but regret that trouble should have arisen as to whether India should share with England the duty of safeguarding the great highway which lay between the two countries. India had been asked to send 1 per cent. of an Army, the whole cost of which was 242,000,000 rupees. The pay of the troops sent out would be but 63,000 rupees for the six or seven months during which they would be employed. Suppose the 63,000 rupees were to be repaid into the Indian Exchequer during the last six months of the year, there would be, on March 31st, 1897, 63,000 rupees more in the balance available in the reduction of the amount to be borrowed for public works. Supposing that so small a sum as that could affect the loan, the annual saving to the Indian taxpayers would be 1,900 rupees, or about £110. Was it possible for any person to conceive that such a sum as that, distributed amongst the many million people in India, could enable the Indian peasant to increase his comforts by so much as a single pinch of salt? It had been said that this was not a question of amount but one of principle. (Cheers and counter cheers.) The real and only question which divided us was whether India had or had not any interest in the stability of the Government in Egypt. The Government of India had always denied that they had any interest in Egypt, but they had admitted that India was more interested in the safety of the Suez Canal and in the Government of Egypt than all her Majesty's possessions on the eastern side of that continent put together; they complained that, while they were called upon to make some contribution, great colonies such as Australia had not been called upon to make a similar contribution. The Government of India must have forgotten that in 1885 Australia sent a contingent to help us in Sudan, and annually contributed large sums for the purpose of maintaining in Australian waters a considerable squadron to defend, not only the commerce of Australia but also that of Europe and India. What was the position of India in this matter? The great self-governing colonies had their agents-general here, men who were well able to make a good bargain for their employers. The Foreign Powers had their ambassadors and their ministers, all of whom had the duty put upon them of making fair and equitable bargains with the English Exchequer. The Government of India had no such agent in this country outside the Government, and therefore it was the bounden duty of the Government of India to endeavour upon every occasion to obtain from the Imperial Exchequer the best terms they possibly could, and he did not think they could be looked upon as anything but advocates. The late Secretary of State for India advised the Government to accept the view of the Indian Government. He was rather surprised that such advice should come from that quarter when he remembered that the Government of which Sir Henry Fowler was a member insisted upon the passing of the Cantonments Acts in opposition to the wishes of the Government of India, and that they acted in opposition to the Government of India in respect to the occupation of Chitral. If that doctrine was to hold good, and the Government of India was to be the only arbiter, he could only say that he had always thought that Parliament expressly reserved to itself the power of acting as arbitrator between the Government of this country and the Government of India. Nor did Parliament act without being adequately advised. The Secretary of State for India was placed in the Cabinet, and defended the views of India in the great council of the nation. The Secretary of State was advised by men of no less experience than those who advised the Viceroy. What had been the case in the present instance? By a large majority the Council of the Secretary of State had advised him to act in the way in which the Government had acted. Sir Alexander Arbuthnot had declared that the supremacy of Egypt in the Sudan was a direct and substantial concern for India. The Government recognised that, and certainly the stable and orderly Government of the Sudan by Egypt could not be established so long as a cruel barbarian had at his mercy the upper waters of the Nile. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Childers who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, said in 1882 that India might bear part of the cost then incurred, and Lord Kimberley, when he introduced a similar Motion in 1885, said there was no question that Egypt was a country in which India had a special interest. He wished next to direct attention to the consistent policy of this country with regard to the maintaining of communications with India by way of Egypt. Before this century dawned, when the East India Company was in power, when the trade between England and India was trifling in comparison with what it was now, it was thought necessary to despatch an expedition to Egypt to co-operate with the English forces there. It was laid down that the East India Company had material interests in the Government of Egypt; and when Nelson had defeated the French fleet he sent a special message to Bombay announcing the result, and the Company immediately sent him a present of £10,000. That was always the policy of the East India Company. In regard to these matters in the East, it was difficult to say where the interests of India ceased, and where those of England began. It might be said that the Canal was not now threatened, and that danger from the Dervishes was imaginary. He did not propose to give any opinion of his own as to the extent of that danger; he only referred their lordships to the book of Sir Alfred Milner, a distinguished public servant, who was the close and confidential adviser of the Government when the noble lord opposite was in power. In that book it was declared that there could be no permanent rest for Egypt so long as barbarism reigned and until order was re-established along the Nile for at least a considerable distance beyond Khartum. They used to hear a good deal from the opposite side about the evacuation of Egypt, but he was happy to think that they did not hear so much said on that point since noble lords opposite had been in office. No one would dream of leaving Egypt so long as there was an explosive barbarism along the banks of the Nile. He thought he had said enough as to the interests of India in Egypt, and he should only say a few words on the policy on the present occasion as compared with former expeditions sent to Egypt. The noble lord then read several extracts from official records to show that on

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

previous occasions decisions were arrived at by Parliament. before the views of the Government of India were received. When they were received they were carefully considered and and precisely the same decision was arrived at. The loan of troops by India to England or by England to India had hitherto been fixed on no definite principles, but henceforth those principles would be clear and incontrovertible. There had been up to the present time no reciprocity between England and India in the matter, but henceforth the principle would be definitely settled. The despatch of the Secretary of State, dated June 30th last, said: "It may be laid down that on all occasions when the temporary loan of a military force is urgently required, either by Great Britain or by India, such assistance will be promptly given so far as the ability, resources, and situation of either country at the time may permit. In the next place, it would seem to be established that, if the object for which such assistance is required is one in which the Government supplying the troops has no special interest beyond that which must be common to all members of the Empire, the whole cost of the force, so long as it is required, including both ordinary and extraordinary charges, must be borne by the Government that needs its assistance. In the third place if the circumstances are such that the Government supplying the troops has a distinct and special interest in the matter at stake, then, although that interest may be less strong than that of the Government requiring assistance, the Government supplying the troops should be content to bear, in one form or another, a portion of the burden which the operations involve." Those were the principles which her Majesty's Government had laid down. When troops were sent to Mombasa the then Government determined that although the Government of India had undoubtedly commercial interests in the country, yet those interests were not sufficient to justify them in throwing upon Indian revenues any portion of the burden. We had never governed India under what was known as the old Colonial system—the system which Spain pursued in respect to her plantations, and we had never drawn steady revenues from our great dependency. All the advantage we had derived from her had been in the expansion of our trade and the development of our commerce. India, before our rule, had always fallen a prey to the rapacious, and it was the duty of her Majesty's Government to protect the people of India, but to do so they had a very heavy cost to bear. Was it too much to expect that some portion of the force which India maintained should be lent when occasion needed for the maintenance of her communication with her powerful protector? Her Majesty's Government were satisfied that in this case they were strictly acting on principles of equity and justice, and, although it would have been easy enough to have yielded to the demands of the Government of India, such a course would not have been in consonance with the duty they owed, not only to the Indian rayat, but also to the British taxpayer. He begged to move the Motion standing in his name.

LORD REAY.

Lord REAY said that in rising to oppose the Motion which the noble Earl had so eloquently proposed he would at once approach the question as to whether India had a distinct and special interest beyond that which must be common to all members of the Empire. A distinct and special interest in the Indian operations was proved by a chain of reasoning of which the accuracy struck him as very doubtful. India was interested in the free transit through the Suez Canal, but had the Khalifa any intention of threatening the Canal? In their letter of March 15th the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury said that a stronger claim could be made out for the payment of the ordinary expenses of the regiment sent to Mombasa than for the retention of that charge upon Indian funds for the troops sent to Suakin. It followed that if the expenditure for the Mombasa regiment was wholly paid by this country, according to the Treasury, it should also be fully paid in this case. In referring to the Abyssinian expedition, Lord Lawrence was of opinion that—"This was neither a feature of hiring or lending, but simply one of payment by the country which employs the troops." He wrote:—"I cannot admit that India has the slightest interest in the question at issue between England and Theodore. We shall be neither stronger nor weaker out here, if he is duly punished for his misdeeds." What Lord Lawrence said of King Theodore applied to Khalifa. When the troops were sent to Malta the whole cost was paid by the Imperial Government, and the costs of the Perak expedition was, "not to be regarded as a precedent for any future case in which troops might be urgently required from the Indian establishments for Imperial purposes." In 1882 the Government of India objected to pay the whole cost, but they were prepared to pay the ordinary expenses chiefly on the ground that India had a "national interest" in the canal. Finally, India received £500,000 to meet an extraordinary expenditure of £1,058,852. Turning to the apportionment of the expenditure when Indian troops were despatched in 1885 to Suakin, on January 17th, 1885, Lord Dufferin's Government used these words: "The operations taking place in the Sudan have no connexion with any Indian interests, and lie altogether outside the sphere of our responsibilities. We can look for neither advantage nor loss from them. The pretensions and the aims of the leaders of the rising in Africa are a matter of indifference to the Government, which is in no way interested in disputing or putting down by force the claims of political or religious pretenders in regions of the world remote from its own limits and from those of its neighbours." And further: "The disposal of Indian revenues for other purposes than those which are strictly connected with the legitimate needs of Indian expenditure is a matter which is watched with increasing concern by all sections of the community in this country. We cannot conceive a case in which the claims of the Indian taxpayer to entire exemption from all share in the cost are more overwhelmingly strong." That despatch was issued by Lord Dufferin, a recognised authority on the Egyptian question, who would certainly not have expressed that opinion if he had considered that India had a substantial interest in the Suakin operations. In 1885 when the Government of the day decided to charge India they had not before them this despatch, whereas the present Government were aware of the opinion of both Lord Dufferin's and Lord Elgin's Governments. The Secretary of State, Lord Cross, informed the Government of India on February 3rd, 1887: "That, in the event of any occasion hereafter arising for the employment of Indian troops on duties not directly attributable to the requirements of your Government or at a distance from India, no portion of the expense should be charged against India without your Excellency's concurrence." The Treasury had been informed on December 21st, 1886, and on January 19th replied that they "make no doubt that, should the occasion again arise for employing Indian troops outside India, the views of the present Government of India and of the present Secretary of State for India in Council on the question of the expense of such employment will be respectfully weighed by the Imperial Government of the day." He should not claim that "the full assent and concurrence of the Government of India" were necessary. In this connexion he wished to remind the House the principle laid down by the Duke of Argyll was to be found in a despatch of November 24th, 1870, in which the noble duke said: "The Government established in India is (from the nature of the case) subordinate to the Imperial Government at home. And no government can be subordinate unless it is within the power of the superior government to order what is to be done or left undone, and to enforce on its officers, through the ordinary and constitutional means, obedience to its directions as to the use which they are to make of official position and power in furtherance of the policy which has been finally decided upon by the advisers of the Crown." This principle was further laid down in a despatch of the noble Marquess the Prime Minister of the 30th May, 1876. But, on the other hand, if the Government of India were consulted too, and expressed a deliberate opinion, the responsibility of overruling them was very great. (Hear, hear.) The difficulties inherent to the Government of India were enormous. When they were placed in a position to act against their convictions these difficulties were increased. This matter would be discussed in the Governor-General's Council. The members of Government would be called upon to justify the decision which had been arrived at here. But how could they "defend in debate what they do not approve"! Circumstances might arise in which such a dilemma was inevitable; but were those circumstances present in this case? It might be argued that the principle was not very important in this case; but it might involve a large amount in another instance. But that argument could not be used, because the Government of India, in paragraph 13 of this despatch of June 30th, said: "The precedent now created can only apply to loans of small bodies of troops, for

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

short periods, and for purposes in which India has a substantial interest." In other words, the amount would always be comparatively a trifling one. The limitation points to the fact that some misgiving was felt about the principle. He thought that it would have been infinitely more politic to not make the charge on this occasion, and to leave the matter open until Lord Welby's Commission had issued its Report, and their financial relations could be placed on a simpler footing, which would give less scope for raising diverging issues, or until that Court of Arbitration had been constituted which the First Lord of the Treasury suggested in another place. They were promised reciprocity, which hitherto had not existed. India had invariably paid for British troops, and even if reciprocity were guaranteed it was likely that India would have to pay more frequently for troops out of India than England for troops sent to India. Lord Lawrence stated in his Minutes of January 20th, 1868, that: "India pays all her own expenses. India does not cost England a shilling." He believed that the public conscience had awakened in this country. The time had come not to drive hard bargains with India. Recently an excise duty had been imposed on the lower counts of cotton manufactures, the product of Indian mills. In India they thought, rightly or wrongly, that the same object might have been attained by freeing from import duty all lower counts. In removing the duty from imported yarns, the handloom industry was absolutely exempt even for the higher class of goods. The salt duty was 2 Rs. per maund in 1882; and the Government of India of that day said that "the tax was still very high in relation to the cost of production of salt." It was now 2½ Rs. per maund. The Army expenditure had increased from 1875-6 to 1892-3 by 77 lakhs. Neither could they forget that the native States had voluntarily placed at our disposal Imperial Service Corps of a total strength of 17,684 men, and Gwalior and Jaipur Transport Corps 942 men and 1,473 animals. That represented an expenditure of 55 lakhs, of which Kashmir paid over 10 lakhs. For this object the Indian Government only spent 2 lakhs; and they had not forgotten how the Kashmir troops distinguished themselves under Colonel Kelly at Chitral, and of what use the Gwalior and Jaipur Transport was to General Low. The Transport was ready to march within 30 hours of the receipt of orders. The native troops sent to Suakin were proud of being selected; and he had no doubt that the Bombay troops would, should the occasion arise, distinguish themselves as the 28th Regiment of N.I. distinguished itself on the last occasion at Suakin. (Hear, hear). There was no unwillingness in India to share in the fortunes of this great Empire. Was it worth while, for the sake of a principle—even if it were admitted to have any application in this instance—to infringe a much more important principle, viz., that we should not create, needlessly, discontent in India? And remember that, on this occasion, the Government represented every section of the community in India and large numbers of our own countrymen. They had been told on a recent occasion that a vote in that House did not affect the fate of the Government of the day, and he hoped that their Lordships would remember that fact when they came to vote on this question. He had no doubt that, if their Lordships acted in regard to this matter with the same generous instinct which they followed in their private affairs, they would vote against this proposal of the Government and would thereby follow the noblest traditions of that House. (Hear, hear).

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE said that he did not think that their lordships would be surprised that he should desire to say a few words in justification of the vote which he intended to give if their lordships proceeded to a division on this question. His connection with India was so recent, his sympathy with the people of India was so deep, and his knowledge of the difficulties which the Government of India had to encounter was so intimate, and that it would be intolerable for him to vote for the Resolution if he believed it would occasion half the injustice which had been attributed to it by the critics of the Government. He believed that the apportionment of the expense which her Majesty's Government proposed was in itself fair and just, and he believed that Lord Elgin's Government, although they had been unsuccessful in obtaining all they wanted, had succeeded in obtaining at the hands of her Majesty's Government the admission of certain principles which, after they had been discussed and considered by the two Governments, and if necessary, supplemented by any machinery which might be found desirable, would place India for the future in an infinitely sounder position with regard to these controversies, than she had ever before occupied. (Hear, hear.) Those principles had received the adhesion not only of the India Office, but of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Leader of the House of Commons, and he felt no doubt that they were quite capable of becoming the basis of a thoroughly satisfactory and business-like arrangement between the two Governments. What, stripped of all adventitious matter, was the question before the House? India had an army of 215,000 soldiers, which she maintained not only for the purpose of internal police but also to defend her vast land frontier of some 5,000 miles. Of that army she was asked to lend for use outside the confines of India a small force, about 1 per cent. of the whole, upon terms which would relieve her entirely of all expense except the ordinary cost of the troops, which she would in any case have to bear. Was that on the face of it a flagrantly unjust arrangement? (Hear, hear.) These troops when at Suakin were less remote from their headquarters in India than they would be if employed in the remoter parts of the Indian Empire itself. Within a space of a month, he believed, it would be possible to send them back to India and replace them by troops from this country. Then there was the question of time. If at the end of the year the Indian troops were still required at Suakin, the whole arrangement would be open to revision. How different was the case from the case of 1885, when the Indian troops were detained at Suakin from March, 1885, to May, 1886, —15 months in all, and for 12 months after hostilities had ended they were engaged on garrison duty in that fortress. India had lent these troops with alacrity. The words were not his. They were those of the dissentient members of the Secretary of State's Council. There was no question of risk. It was a question of rupees. If he believed that there was any real risk to India, he for one would have been no party to putting pressure upon her. The question of risk and the question of money must not be mixed up. If the thing was wrong payment would not make it right, and he submitted that there was no doctrine more offensive to India than that which went to show that the scruples of the Power which lent the troops in a case of this kind ought to be overcome by the assumption on the part of the borrowing Power of the whole liability for the cost. If that argument were advanced, he should certainly meet it by saying that it was the duty of the Government to remove the temptation from the leading Power by deciding that in no circumstances should the Power which lent the troops be placed in the position of making a profit by the transaction. (Hear, hear.) As to the plea of the poverty of India, the Government were not asking India to put her hand in her pocket for a single rupee; and he felt sure the Government of India would desire that this matter should be decided not upon principles of generosity or charity, but on principles of the strictest equity and justice. (Hear, hear.) Coming to the question of precedents, he did not suggest that too much importance should be attached to them. They might be bad, and in certain cases it might be that they should be set aside; but, so far as they were applicable to the present case, the precedents seemed to him to make entirely in favour of the Government. In cases of this kind there had always been a division of the expense between India and England, not by any means always on terms so favourable to India as the present. The noble lord opposite suggested that as a Royal Commission was investigating the financial relations of the two countries, England might be liberal and pay their bill without fuss. He should have thought that the reasonable thing to do was not to change the practice *pendente lite*, but to abide by the precedents. If he did not attach much importance to precedents, neither did he desire to attach too much importance to the *obiter dicta* which had been delivered on the one side or the other in Parliament. The actors in these controversies changed, but the parts they played are always the same. The Treasury was always the Treasury. (Hear, hear.) The Chancellor of the Exchequer was only the vigilant guardian of the public purse, as the Government of India was the guardian of the interests of the Indian taxpayer. Therefore these utterances must be interpreted with very careful regard to the circumstances in which they were delivered. Without going to the remoter precedents, he would like to notice what had been said with regard to those of 1882 and 1885. What the Government of India protested against in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

1882 was the payment of the whole expense of the Egyptian expedition, and they eventually gained their point; but he did not think India was very magnificently treated, for she had to be grateful for the payment of half a million of money which left her liable for the whole of the ordinary expenses of the troops and 60 per cent. of the extraordinary expenses. (Hear, hear.) Then there was the Suakin expedition of 1885. The Government of India at that time were undoubtedly very sore indeed. They had a three-fold grievance. In the first place they complained of the absence of reciprocity as between the Indian and British Governments. In the next place they complained of being called upon to pay for military operations outside the limits of Egypt proper. In the third place they were indignant, and not entirely without reason, because the Resolution was carried in both Houses of Parliament before their protest had been laid upon the Table of the House. That indignity, at all events, the Government of India had been spared on the present occasion, nor was there any intention of requiring them to pay the whole expense of the expedition. The arguments which were advanced in 1882 and 1885 were directed, they would find, entirely to these three points; the first two points had been disposed of—they admitted fully that there should henceforth be absolute and complete reciprocity between England and India in these matters. The question, then, that remained was that of the interest of India in the Sudan. It had been conceded, and he did not think it would be disputed, that India had a very distinct interest in Egypt proper, in the maintenance of the authority of the Khedive, and in the security of the Canal. But it was contended that the interest of India was strictly limited to the immediate vicinity of the Canal? It could not be seriously contended that India could regard an outbreak of fanaticism in the Sudan with the same indifference as that with which she would regard an outbreak of fanaticism in China. Would anyone be found to pretend that a serious reverse to the Khedive's army would not shake the authority of the Khedive in Egypt proper? There could be no doubt about it. Then they were sometimes told that in this case we interfered, not forsooth because India was interested, but because we wished to do what was agreeable to our ally the Government of Italy. They had been perfectly candid in their expressions in regard to this part of the case; they had never disguised from the public the fact that the moment of our intervention was determined by the necessities of the Government of Italy, and surely it required no proof to show that it was for the interest of Egypt, and therefore of India, that they should extricate, as they had successfully extricated, our Italian allies from the imminent peril of a great catastrophe the effect of which might have been felt far beyond the limits of Egypt itself. With reference to our interest in the Sudan, he would like to read to the House the words of an authority whose weight would, he thought, be recognised by many of their lordships: "The Eastern Sudan is indispensable to Egypt. It will cost you far more to retain your hold upon Egypt proper if you abandon your hold of the Eastern Sudan to the Mahdi than what it would to retain your hold upon the Eastern Sudan by the aid of such material as exists in the provinces. . . . . The danger to be feared is not that the Mahdi will march northward through Wady Halfa; on the contrary, it is very improbable that he will ever go so far north. The danger is altogether of a different nature. It arises from the influence which the spectacle of a Muhammadan power, established close to your frontiers, will exercise upon the population which you govern. In all the cities in Egypt it will be felt that what the Mahdi has done they may do; and, as he has driven out the intruder and the infidel, they may do the same. . . . . If the whole of the Eastern Sudan is surrendered to the Mahdi the Arab tribes on both sides of the Red Sea will take fire. . . . . I see it is proposed to fortify Wady Halfa and prepare there to resist the Mahdi's attacks. You might as well fortify against a fever. Contagion of that kind cannot be kept out by fortifications and garrisons. But that it is real and that it does exist will be denied by no one cognisant with Egypt and the East." Those were the words of General Gordon immediately before his last departure from this country. Our policy was that of recognising the interest of India in Egypt and in all that concerned the stability of the Egyptian Government. Was it the case that in giving effect to that policy we had dealt illiberally with India? He should like to remind the House of a fact which might not be generally known. For the last twelve years we had maintained in Egypt a British force varying between 3,000 and 8,000 men; we had borne the whole of the ordinary cost of that force, and, although Egypt had undertaken to bear the extraordinary expense belonging to it, her contribution had not, he was able to say, been equivalent to the actual outlay. He would say nothing of the disorganisation of our military system at home which had arisen from the detention of these troops in Egypt. For all this we had not charged anything at all to India on account of the Egyptian garrison, and he would take upon himself to say that if a strict profit and loss account were opened as between this country and India on account of the occupation of Egypt it would be found that the Government of India had been by no means hardly or illiberally dealt with. (Hear, hear.) It was not infrequently urged that they were treating India in this matter much more hardly than they would venture to treat any of our own colonies. He knew that the colonial analogy was a somewhat doubtful one, because ever since 1870 our policy had been to concentrate our troops in this country and to leave in the colonies only such forces as were requisite for the defence of our coaling stations and naval bases. On the other hand, in the case of India it was no exaggeration to say that our whole military system was based upon the requirements of India. They had altered, in 1881 he believed, the distribution of the soldiers' service, as between service with the Colours and service in the Reserve, for the express purpose of suiting the convenience of India. The result was that the men serving in this country were younger, and that the number of men entering the Reserve had been smaller than they otherwise would have been. The colonial analogy was, therefore, not entirely on all fours with the case of India. If Imperial troops were lent to a colony the War Office invariably claimed the extra cost, the whole or part of it, but they made no claim for the ordinary pay and allowances of the force. The Ashanti expedition was a case in point—the Gold Coast bore the cost, but not the ordinary cost of the troops employed. Where one colony lent troops to another the lending colony always bore the ordinary cost of the troops which were lent. Then there was the case which had been referred to of New South Wales, which lent a contingent for service in the Suakin operations of 1885, and cheerfully and readily bore the whole cost of that contingent. (Cheers.) It seemed to him that these facts went to show that they were requiring India to do what the mother country did if she was lending troops to a colony, what the colonies did if they were lending troops to the mother country, and what one colony did if it lent troops to another colony. He had a very strong hope that when the despatch of the Secretary of State for India had been considered in that country it would be found that the Secretary of State had placed the position of India upon a very much sounder basis than it had ever occupied before. India had had some hard bargains, and she had not entirely forgotten them. He had a very sincere hope that we should frequently see native troops taking the field by the side of our own soldiers: he believed that this would be good for the troops of India and for our own troops; and when those occasions arose he was honestly convinced that it would be found that the Indian Government had been successful in securing terms which, possibly amplified and developed, would form the basis of an arrangement between the two Governments, founded upon common sense and equity, and one which could be adopted by both Governments without the slightest discredit or loss of dignity. (Cheers.)

LORD KIMBERLEY.

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY said he had very naturally been referred to in the course of the debate, because, as Secretary of State for India in 1885, he undoubtedly supplied one precedent which had an important bearing on the question before the House. And, before he made any general remarks on the matter, he should like to say a word or two as to what really happened in 1885, because the noble marquess a little misunderstood it. The noble marquess seemed to think that the Government of India at that time suffered a certain amount of indignity by not being consulted. But the fact was that when it was decided that troops should go to Suakin he telegraphed the intention of her Majesty's Government to the Government of India. It seemed to him now, as then, that there was no ambiguity in the statement he telegraphed to the Government of India as to the ordinary expenses being borne by the revenues of India. If the Government of India had a doubt in their minds, why did they not telegraph to him to enquire

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

what was the precise meaning of his telegram, and also to inform him, when they had learnt that precise meaning, that they desired to lay a protest before him? If the Government of India had taken that course there was not the slightest doubt that he should have waited until that protest had been laid before him; but it was clear that, having received no remonstrance from them after they had been told what was about to be done, he thought he was quite justified in going to Parliament and saying that he had received no opposition from that Government. He regretted that things took place as they did, because it would have been very much better that he should have had the opinion of the Government of India before him, especially as he gave them by his telegram every opportunity of laying their case, if they so desired, before the Government of the day. His personal position might be said to be somewhat difficult after that precedent, but he freely admitted that on that occasion the Government took the course which had been taken by the present Government; and he also admitted that he used at that time the expression which had been quoted, that he considered the war in the Sudan had arisen out of our occupation of Egypt. One noble lord who had spoken had said that it was not always very wise to be governed by precedents, because there might be bad precedents, and he was inclined to confess that the precedent he had set up was not a good precedent. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He was free to admit that a good deal had happened since then, and that his views at present were certainly not precisely those held by the Government of which he was a member and by himself in those days. He was now very decidedly of opinion, after an experience of ten years, during which the safety of Egypt had never been in danger, that the expedition in the Sudan on which the Government had embarked was unnecessary, dangerous, and likely to lead to very unfortunate results. Far from believing that it was likely to be beneficial to Egypt, his opinion was that it was likely to be extremely injurious, and on that ground he thought it extremely natural that anyone connected with the Government of India should demur to spending Indian money on the enterprise. He noted that the Prime Minister made a remark the other day which seemed to place the present enterprise upon rather a different ground than that of the safety of Egypt, for he said that we were morally bound, as far as possible, to see that Egypt was not in a worse position, as regarded her possession of territory, than she was when we intervened in 1885, and when the Government of Egypt was advised to withdraw from the Sudan. Now that was not precisely the same consideration as the safety of Egypt, and when he heard Sir Alfred Milner quoted as an authority he could not help wishing that they could have the opinion of a far higher authority. (Hear, hear.) Their adviser in 1885 was not Sir Alfred Milner, but Lord Cromer, whose views he had had an opportunity of ascertaining from frequent discussion of the subject. No man had studied the subject deeper, or was more capable than Lord Cromer of taking a fair, an unprejudiced, and calm view of the matter, and he was very curious to know what advice Lord Cromer gave to the Government in regard to the present expedition. (Hear, hear). But there was a far more important point for consideration than the opinions of any former Secretary of State in this delicate matter between the Imperial Government and the Government of India. The Under Secretary for India seemed to think that the matter would be solved by the principles laid down by the present Secretary of State in the Despatch published in the Papers before the House. He was glad to admit that he thought both the tone in which that Despatch was couched and the nature of the proposals submitted, would tend to advance the solution of the matter. But he doubted whether, after all, the really practical difficulty would be thus met, for the Secretary of State used the words on which everything depended:—"If the circumstances are such that the Government of India supplying the troops has a distinct and special interest in the matter at stake." The whole difficulty was how they were going to decide that point. On what principles were they to decide that India had a distinct and special interest? Who was to decide? (Hear, hear). The Government of India not unnaturally winced under the decisions of the Government at home. They had strong opinions and they naturally formed those opinions with reference to Indian opinion, and he did not in the least complain that they sought to place their views before the Home Government strongly in the interests of the Indian taxpayer. But he agreed with the declaration that the ultimate decision, in this as in other matters, could not be removed from the Government and the Parliament of this country. It was a question of discretion in the application of a principle from which we could not swerve. The Imperial power was here, and it must remain here. But it was a power that must be used with the utmost circumspection and the greatest tenderness towards the opinion of the Government of India, because it was a power which was naturally somewhat invidious though necessary. India was not in the position of a colony with what was called a responsible Government; it was essentially a dependency, though one so great and with interests so important that the utmost care should be taken never to press the exercise of our supremacy, except in cases where it was really necessary, and where we were convinced that we were not raising in India a feeling altogether disproportionate to the advantage we might gain by insisting on our position. (Hear, hear). That was really the gist of the matter, and what he complained of was that in the present case the Government, for the sake of a principle, with which he agreed, had pressed very far a small matter in regard to which Indian opinion was very strong. He thought that in this case it was much to be lamented that her Majesty's Government, after receiving the protest they did from the Government of India, did not, while maintaining generally the principle involved, make some concession to them. In all these matters they wanted a hearty concurrence, so that no controversy might be raised in these matters between England and India. He agreed with the famous saying of the noble Marquess that India was not to be regarded as a barrack from which we might continually draw troops. We had a right to look to the Government of India for assistance in a time of great difficulty, but he thought it would be very unwise if we got too much into the habit of looking upon the Indian Army as a source of strength upon which we could lightly draw. The reasons were obvious. The army was not beyond the requirements of India, for, though happily there was great tranquility in India, and great loyalty among her native Princes, yet it was always possible that some sudden storm might arise, and it had been a maxim, therefore, that the Indian army should always be in a condition to take the field at a moment's notice. For that reason we ought only in case of great necessity to draw troops from India. (Hear, hear). He held that if there was any place in the world in which India had an interest it was Egypt. (Hear, hear.) It was not necessary to make a careful creditor and debtor calculation and thus try to lay down the precise fraction of interest in Egypt which should belong to India and which should belong to the home country. It was sufficient, he thought, to lay down the general proposition that the way to India lay through the Mediterranean and Egypt, always, of course, assuming that it was to the interest of India that the connection with this country should be maintained. Assuming that he did not see how it was possible not to admit that, as regarded Egypt proper, India had such an interest in Egypt that it was reasonable she should pay something. But he had always thought that in these matters they should, if possible, avoid controversies which had to be carried on in public. There was nothing more likely to injure the connection between the Government of India and the home Government than controversies, sometimes partaking almost of an angry character. The very business of the Viceroy and of the Secretary of State was as far as possible to so arrange matters that they should never come to a point where there was to be a point of difference which was to be displayed at all. That was the secret of the just and wise government of India. Quite apart from any political or Party feeling, he regretted that a matter of this kind should come before Parliament. Looking at the matter all round, considering the smallness of the amount in dispute, considering the fact that there were divergent opinions as to the proprietary of the expedition to the Sudan, considering the strong opinion of the Government of India, and, lastly, considering that Lord Cross had wisely given an extension of a sort of *quasi*-representative institutions to the Councils in India which increased the necessity for greater caution in this matter, he regretted that this controversy should have arisen.

LORD NORTHBROOK.

The EARL OF NORTHBROOK said he had heard his noble friend make many speeches in this House, but he had never heard a

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

speech of his in which his power of debate and his adroitness in dealing with questions had been more conspicuously shown than in the speech just delivered. The point his noble friend had to explain was how it came to pass that, while he as Secretary of State for India had in circumstances almost precisely similar taken exactly the same course which her Majesty's Government had now taken, he was a party to the opposition to the vote which their lordships were now asked to pass; but hardly any words of his speech were devoted to answering that question. The noble earl talked about looking at the matter all round, but it seemed to him his noble friend's views depended upon the side of the House on which he sat. He did not think the House fully appreciated the position of his noble friend. Near his noble friend sat Lord Rosebery and the Marquess of Ripon. He presumed they were all going to vote against the resolution. (The Earl of Rosebery: "Hear, hear.") After the melancholy death of General Gordon, and when the Government had decided to advance to Khartum, Indian troops were, in pursuance of a resolution passed by both Houses, sent to Suakin. But on May 15, in consequence of disturbances on the frontier of India, the Government gave up altogether the expedition to the Sudan, but they continued for a year to keep the Indian troops at Suakin. He maintained that when the expedition was given up the necessity for the Indian troops ceased to exist. The Government of India took that view, and at the beginning of 1886 they wrote to Mr. Gladstone's Government, of which his noble friend was a member ——

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY said the Government of India addressed their letter to Lord Randolph Churchill, who was then Secretary of State.

The EARL OF NORTHBROOK said the letter was addressed to Lord Randolph Churchill, but it was answered by the noble earl. (The Earl of Kimberley: "Yes.") The Government of India contended that, as the original intention of the expedition was given up, it was only fair that the whole of the expenses of the troops, who merely formed the garrison at Suakin, should fall on the British Government. His noble friend did not attempt to answer that argument; he only said he did not think it was a good thing to make application to the Treasury. Where was the consistency of his noble friend in going into the lobby against this resolution? (Hear, hear.) He personally did not think the Government had acted wisely in putting this small charge upon the Government of India—(Opposition cheers)—but having been a party to a similar course in the past, he could not go into the lobby against the Government. He welcomed the proposals made by the Secretary of State in his last despatch respecting the principles upon which the future military charges should be arranged. The principle of reciprocity had been laid down in the despatch, it had been accepted by the Government. It was a principle for which the Indian Government had always contended, and he thought the concession of the principle would give great satisfaction to the Indian Government and in India generally. It was, however, still left in doubt who was to settle whether there were or were not special interests on one side or the other. If that was left open they would have precisely the same controversies in the future that they now had, and no good would be done by the proposal of the Secretary of State. (Hear, hear.) He had gathered that the Government intended to take precautions that the "proposals should not remain a dead letter." The proposal of Lord Cross with regard to the employment of Indian troops was that the expenses should not be charged upon India without the consent of the Government of India. He presumed if that proposal was attached to the proposal of the Secretary of State for India there would be some arrangement that the Government of Great Britain should say what were British interests and that the Government of India should say what were Indian interests. That would be fair to both parties, and he did not see that there would be any danger in it. He regretted that Lord Kimberley had expressed dissent from the liberal view of Lord Cross: and he still more regretted it as Sir Henry Fowler, in the other House, had expressed entire concurrence in the opinion of Lord Cross. Mr. Balfour made another suggestion which was well worthy of consideration; he suggested whether the time had not arrived when they might with advantage to India and to England constitute some kind of tribunal of arbitration for the determination of this class of question—some tribunal in which the interests of Great Britain and India alike would be equally represented. If the Government were to make a declaration that it was their intention in connection with the Government of India to make some arrangement of that kind it would go, he ventured to say, a great way to counteract—he believed entirely counteract—any ill-feeling which had been raised in India about the miserable contention as to £30,000 for the troops at Suakin. He ventured to submit that for the consideration of her Majesty's Government. (Hear, hear.)

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.

The DUKE OF ARGYLL said no member of the House had had a harder and stiffer battle to fight on behalf of the Indian Treasury than himself, for it so happened that his tenure of the office coincided with the great organisation of the English Army effected by Mr. Cardwell and Mr. Lowe. At that time the principle was taken up that, as at least one-third of the Army was kept up for the sake of India, India ought to bear one-third of the whole charges, home charges included. He had a fierce battle to defend the Indian Government from that new doctrine which was pressed with great plausibility. He resisted it to the death, and with the assistance of Mr. Gladstone and other members of the Government, that erroneous and dangerous principle was negatived, and it had been negatived ever since. He believed that the principles distinctly expressed in the Despatch would place the Government of India in a better position than it ever before occupied. The charge was a just and a fair charge, and he could not help saying that he viewed with great satisfaction the change in the public mind on the whole of this question. It was not merely that the opinion of the Government had changed; the sentiments of the public had changed. At one time to which he referred there was no Party in the House of Commons to defend the Government of India from the attacks made on it. It was evident that the real objections raised on the other side of the House were to the operations on the Nile. (Hear, hear.) They denied that the Sudan advance could be brought within the category of measures for the defence of the Indian Empire. He must frankly confess that he looked upon the expedition with immense satisfaction. (Cheers.) Egypt would not be Egypt until the valley of the Nile was cleared of savages and her commerce thrown open to Europe. (Hear, hear.) So far therefore from feeling that Indian interests were specially injured in this case, he held, on the contrary, that India was honoured in having a part of those great operations which he trusted would bring within the boundary of civilisation those vast territories which were now desolated by the Mahdi. (Cheers.)

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY called the attention of the House to a speech delivered on February 13th, 1893, by the Marquess of Salisbury, in which he said—"All these are ways of saving the English Estimates, which no doubt might seem very smart and very ingenious to those persons who arrange the figures at the English Treasury, but would not be so satisfactory on the other side of the water. You must not measure a financial injury by the number of thousand pounds involved. If people feel that their money is being taken from them, it matters very little whether it figures as thousands or tens of thousands. I regret the arrangement very much; I cannot see any reason for it."

LORD WELBY.

Lord WELBY said he was disappointed with the speech of the noble marquess, because he recollected a speech which had been delivered by him some two years ago, in which, referring to the extent of the Indian cotton duties, he spoke of the danger England incurred of losing the favour of India. The noble marquess then addressed a general warning to their lordships, and said that it was idle to conceal from themselves that many causes were at work which should make them pause before they did anything to shake the confidence of the people of India in the absolute disinterestedness of our rule. (Hear, hear.) That speech had converted him, in a measure, from those opinions in which he had been trained. He was trained from his youth in the strongest Treasury traditions; he was taught that their master was the British taxpayer, and that their first duty was to do everything to make his burden light. But was there not some reason for arguing that they might be buying gold too dear, even if the Government established the soundness of the principles for which it contended. One

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

partner sent troops in aid of the other partner, charging only those additional expenses which would not be incurred if the troops remained at home—he believed that was the condition which had been generally observed. But he was aware that the Indian Government maintained that on certain occasions it had not been observed, one great occasion being that of the Indian Mutiny, when the whole cost of the English troops which India borrowed was thrown on the Indian Exchequer. He thought they must admit that high authority both in India and England had pronounced against there being such an interest as had been suggested, and it was very seldom that there had been such a general agreement, not only among experts, but in the press, and even in the press which supported the Government.

Lord ROSEBERY: Hear, hear.

Lord WELBY: The Government were not carrying out those wise maxims which the noble marquess used in the speech which he had referred to.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE said that speech was delivered against a proposal to deprive the Government of India of a part of its revenues and force it to resort to taxation. The present proposal did not touch the revenues and would not require the Government of India to resort to one farthing of taxation. (Cheers.)

Lord WELBY said he quite agreed that that was so, but he thought the remarks of the noble marquess were applicable in view of the stress he laid on the necessity of showing to the people of India that the Government at home acted in all respects where India was concerned with the utmost disinterestedness. He was the last person in the world to regard this sum as a light one. It was true that the Chancellor of the Exchequer only reserved for himself a modest surplus, but that was very considerably in advance of the sum about which they were now speaking.

LORD SALISBURY.

The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I have been much struck with the fate which has pursued noble lords opposite. In two instances of late they have been compelled to repeat the part of Balaam—they had been brought here to curse but they have remained to bless. (Hear, hear, and laughter). The matter before the House appears to me to be one to be determined, not according to sentiment or to feeling, but according to strict justice. I join most heartily in everything that has been said by noble lords opposite as to the necessity of convincing the multitudes of India of our sense of justice, and of our desire to do them justice and to respect their interests and their rights. But I have an equal feeling of respect for the interests and the rights of British taxpayers, and I do not think that the danger of neglecting the interests and the rights of the latter, and compelling them to pay that which in justice they are not bound to pay, is altogether inferior to the danger which the noble lord opposite has dwelt upon so earnestly as likely to arise from neglecting the interests and rights of the taxpayers of India. We admit that the sum involved in this question is a small one, which of itself would be of but small importance, but the payment of that sum involves a principle of great interest to the British taxpayer, and our experience of what occurred in Lancashire last year has shown us that, where there is a sense of injustice entertained by the British constituencies, questions of policy will not prevent them from striking a blow in favour of their own view of what is just. Our duty in this matter, therefore, is to observe the most careful and complete justice. The noble lord who has just sat down has dwelt upon the importance of not keeping to a principle if the sum involved by it is a small one. If the noble lord had acted upon that principle when he was at the Treasury I can scarcely say how much of his well-known activity in that department would have survived. (Hear, hear, and laughter). However, I do not believe that the finance of a great Empire, or even of a small concern, can be conducted on the principle that where the sum involved is but small every claim against it must be admitted. (Hear, hear). This question has been so thoroughly discussed, and the present is such an inconvenient time for discussing it, that I shall not enter very far into the matter, but I wish to ask your Lordships to consider what the real point at issue is. I have heard a great deal about the Sudan expedition, and I am quite prepared to defend the action of the Government in respect to it, because I believe that it will be of great benefit to Egypt and to India. But in moving the Indian troops we were not actuated by a desire to send them there for the purpose of their taking part in that expedition—in fact, not a single Indian solder has been sent to the valley of the Nile. The object which we had in view in moving the Indian troops was the defence of Suakin, and if that place had not been defended at the expense of the Indian taxpayer it must have been defended at the expense of the British taxpayer. It is true that at the time of the Sudan expedition was first contemplated I received a communication from his Imperial Majesty the Sultan of Turkey to defend Suakin if we found it necessary to leave that place during the continuance of the expedition; but that offer I then declined. I am almost now inclined to regret that we did not accept the offer, because had we done so the arguments we should have had to make use of in defending our position might have been of a less difficult character. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The question, however, before us is this—Is the Indian or the British taxpayer to defend Suakin and to prevent it from being taken possession of by some other Power? In our opinion, the whole of the southern littoral of the Red Sea is of interest to India. It is true that a portion of that littoral is at present held by Italy; but, speaking of that territory as matters stood a few years ago, the whole of the southern littoral of the Red Sea depended upon Egypt for its defence. Can it be said in such circumstances that India has no interest in the southern shores of the Red Sea or of the Gulf of Aden, which, in a political sense, are merely continuations of the Suez Canal. If the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, or the Gulf of Aden fell into the hands of another Power it would be India, and not England, that would suffer the most, because the former would be deprived of her military supplies. Even the present arrangements with regard to the shore of the Red Sea shows clearly which part of the Empire has the greatest interest in that line of communication between this country and India. Aden is situated at the very mouth of the Red Sea, and the defence of Aden is paid for, not by the taxpayers of this country—it is entirely in the hands of India. This shows what an interest India has in the southern littoral of the Red Sea. I need scarcely refer to the precedents of 1801, 1876, 1882, or 1885, when expeditions were sent to the shores of the Red Sea, and when the ordinary expenses of the Indian troops employed in them, and generally something more, were charged to the Indian Treasury. Therefore, in the present circumstances, we might justly have called upon India to contribute something towards the preservation of her communications through the Red Sea. But we have called upon her for no contribution at all; all that we have done has been to ask her not to make money out of our request for the loan of a portion of her troops. If you refuse this vote the only result will be that the accounts of the revenue for India next year will show so much money gained by lending Indian troops to this country. (Hear, hear.) There is nothing that has occurred in the course of this Debate with which I more sympathise than the regret which has been expressed that this matter should have been made the subject of Parliamentary discussion and of party sophistry and ingenuity. It appears likely that such a discussion may do some little harm. It is not a very admirable thing—and, indeed, there is something rather squalid in the fact—that there should be a contest between the two parts of the Empire as to what share each should bear in the expenses of its defence. (Hear, hear.) Moreover, such a discussion must lead to the inevitable injury which, as the noble earl opposite has pointed out, must result from disclosing Departmental communications, which are not always couched in a judicial tone. I do not think that that injury will be avoided by flinging aside all questions of financial economy on the ground that the sum asked for is a small one, and, therefore, no matter what the principle involved may be, the claim ought to be acceded to. I do not think that that would be a wise way of avoiding the difficulty, or that in the long run it would even be for the benefit of India. (Hear, hear.) We must try to adopt some way by which these discussions may be avoided in the future. I have no doubt that Parliament will be able to fix upon some principle by which these contributions by the different parts of the Empire will be regulated. In this view the Government have adopted an absolutely stationary attitude with regard to this subject. We have had regard to precedent, and we have adhered entirely to the position which our predecessors occupied in connection with this question. The whole subject is under investigation by a Royal Commission, who, it may be hoped, will furnish

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

suggestions for regulations to which the Government of the day may be able to conform without any fear that the steps which they may think necessary for the defence of the Empire will be made the subject of discussions which may be injurious to the interests of that Empire. (Hear, hear.) I do not know whether I am out of order in referring to such matters on the present occasion, but I hope that I may be allowed to say that early in the present year I was so impressed in favour of such a course being adopted that I laid before my colleagues a proposal for the appointment of a tribunal which should be so impartially composed as to obtain the confidence of the taxpayers of both England and India, which should consider the relative interests and rights of the two portions of the Empire; but when we came to consider the details of the proposal we came to the conclusion that we could not carry such a scheme into effect until the Royal Commission had made their Report. I much regret that it was necessary to postpone the consideration of such a proposal, because I am satisfied that if it were carried into effect we should have reached a solution of the difficulty which would operate in a far better manner than the present system does, and would enable us in many ways to show our sympathy and generosity to our Indian fellow-subjects. (Cheers.) But, my Lords, the issue before you to-night is not even that. If you resolve that the money shall not be granted, after the House of Commons has come to an exactly opposite decision, obviously the first principles of the whole question will be in a state of the greatest confusion. It will add enormously to the difficulty of arriving at maxims and rules in which we may all agree, and make it far more difficult to prevent in the future the occurrence of these unpleasant discussions. I earnestly hope that your Lordships will follow the precedents uniformly set and vote for this Resolution, and so enable us with as little loss of time as possible to place the matter upon a footing which shall avoid the chances of any difference or any distrust, on a question which is comparatively small, arising between the peoples of these two great parts of the Empire.

LORD ROSEBERY.

The Earl of ROSEBERY: My Lords, I have been much too long a member of this House to engage your attention for more than a minute or two at the witching hour at which we have arrived; and certainly I have no wish to introduce any controversial matter more than is necessary into the debate which I think must have been singularly satisfactory to the members and supporters of this House. I do not recollect having ever heard a debate in which so statesmanlike a view had been taken of the responsibilities of public men in addressing themselves to a grave and delicate question than has been the case to-night. Personalities have been happily and conspicuously absent. I do not even deprecate the noble earl's allusion to the singular tenderness of his own conscience as compared with those of others. (Laughter.) We remember the old story of the Pharisee and the publican, and we are not particularly surprised to see that line of argument continued to the present day. (Laughter.) The noble marquess who has just sat down has, as is not unusual with him, supplied a totally new explanation of the policy which a united Government is pursuing. We have never heard before, in any speech or any public document, of the necessity of garrisoning Suakin. I look in vain in the despatch of the Secretary of State. I do not think I heard every word of the speech of the noble earl the Under Secretary this evening, but I do not recollect that that argument occurred in it, and I am quite sure it did not occur in the speech of the noble marquess the Secretary of State for War. The noble marquess has an agreeable way of springing these agreeable surprises on us, and I am one of the last to complain, because I think it adds largely to the interest and excitement of the debates in this House. (Laughter.) But when I am asked by the noble marquess as to who it is that should be responsible for the garrisoning of Suakin, and when I am told that this call for the Indian troops has really nothing to do with any attack on the Dervishes——

The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I did not say that. I said it had very little to do with it.

The EARL OF ROSEBERY: Very well; very little to do with it. The primary object was the garrisoning of Suakin. I am quite willing to take that; but when I am told that, I have to ask myself how was it that the garrison had been depleted. What has occurred to empty the garrison of Suakin? And I am compelled to answer the question in this way—that the troops were required for a march against the Dervishes, and for that reason troops were summoned from India. Surely the noble Marquess does not greatly help his case by starting this new theory of the garrisoning of Suakin, which, after all, is exactly the same explanation in different words as we have had before. (Hear, hear). That, after all is the main gist of the matter. The noble lord who represents the Treasury, and in so agreeable and competent a way—(laughter)—told us with absolute truth that the gist of the matter lies in this—has the Indian Empire any interest in the expedition you are conducting in the Sudan? (Hear, hear). The noble Marquess says they must fill up the gap caused at Suakin. The two propositions come to exactly the same thing, and we who are interested in this matter, and who are anxious to deal justice to India in spite of the many precedents which have been quoted—and I think too much stress has been laid upon them—have to ask ourselves, what is the interest of India in the crushing of the Khalifa? We have heard a great deal about the security of the Suez Canal. We were told that the Suez Canal was the route to India, and that India had a direct interest in its preservation. But what we do not hear from any of the numerous speeches made on behalf of the Government is this—in what way the existence of the Khalifa or of the Dervishes menaces directly or indirectly, the security of the Suez Canal. (Hear, hear). I am quite ready to admit that India has a certain interest in Egypt. If you are going to press that argument it will take you a great deal too far. If you ask me in what foreign questions India has an interest and how far India represents our interest in a great many external questions, you will be led into a scale of contemplated expenditure on the part of India from which I think even the present Government would shrink. (Hear, hear). It would not be difficult to prove that all our Mediterranean interests are in the main connected with India. I cannot deny the direct force of the reasoning that would make it so, because if you had no Indian Empire you might get out of the Mediterranean altogether; but I should be astonished if the noble marquess, carrying out this principle to its logical conclusion, were to bring before Parliament a proposal for settling the expenses of the occupation of Gibraltar, and of Malta, and of the Mediterranean fleet on the revenues of India. Though they are vast, they are interests you can logically connect with India; but I defy anybody to connect this expedition against the Dervishes with the interests of India. (Cheers). If it were to crush a Muhammadan pretender on the frontier of Afghanistan, or in that region with which I am so painfully familiar, the Pamirs, I can imagine going to great risk and expense to put down a false prophet of that description. But the difficulty with this false prophet is to get at him—(laughter)—to find him, to penetrate the almost impenetrable deserts which surround him—deserts which have no connection, direct or indirect with India. (Hear, hear.) One speaker, I think it was the Under Secretary, quoted General Gordon as bearing on this point. I would advise him not to quote too much from General Gordon with regard to the Sudan. I have not all his works at my hand, but I remember a very powerful and vehement passage in which he speaks of the Sudan as the most absolutely valueless possession that any country could possess; that it was useless to any human being, and fatal to any Power that held it. I say, then, that I do not believe that you can prove by any process of logic, or by any process of sophistry, that India has the slightest interest in this expedition. (Hear, hear.) The noble marquess says we use strong language with regard to this proposition, and he warns us against disregarding the interests of the British taxpayer in this matter. Why, when you are flinging the money of the British taxpayer out of the window by handfuls—(hear, hear, and laughter)—do you suddenly discover reasons to justify the pilfering from India of this paltry £35,000? (Cheers.) It is not we who use strong language. It is your own papers who use strong language—(laughter)—The *Times*, the *Standard*, the whole of the provincial Conservative press; and I think, if I can rack my memory so far, it is only in the faithful *Daily Telegraph* that you can still find a supporter of your policy. (Hear, hear.) I do not know where you will find the interests of the taxpayer represented. If you go to Lancashire—I should not be particularly afraid to face the verdict of Lancashire. What I say is, you are speaking of a thing you cannot [illegible] You are pretending—for I am sorry to say it is a

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

pretence—to be consulting the interests of the British taxpayer in this operation, and in doing it you disregard the principles of Imperial policy, which the British taxpayer grasps because they are simple, and which he will not disregard or forget. (Hear, hear.) The British taxpayer knows, if you do not know, that in questions where the Government of India unanimously differ from us on a principle of liability, though we need not go the full length of the declaration of the noble viscount, which has made so great a difference in our relations with India, and to an enormous degree affects the value of the precedents which have been cited—though we need not go to the full length of that declaration, the British taxpayer knows, and we know, that in these questions of liability with India we owe it to our own honour and our own dignity to show a singular tenderness for the interests of India when we are judges, and judges in a case to which we are parties. (Cheers.) I shall not detain the House another moment. I will only say that I never with more satisfaction in my life gave a vote against a motion than I give a vote against the Resolution of the noble earl to-night. (Cheers.)

The House divided:—

Contents	92
Not-contents	40
Majority for the Resolution	52

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Anglo-Indian and Eurasian Regiments.—Petition of the Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Associations, for formation; to lie upon the Table.

COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether there was shortly to be a vacancy in the post of the President of the Royal Engineering College, Cooper's Hill; and, if so, whether, in appointing a successor, the claims of eminent civil engineers to fill the post would be favourably considered, as the college was an institution for the education of civil engineers.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: There will be a vacancy next September in the post of President of Cooper's Hill College. The claims of all classes of officers, qualified to succeed to the vacancy have received full consideration and an appointment will, I hope, be shortly announced.

MEDAL FOR SERVICE IN CENTRAL AFRICA.

Captain BOWLES asked the Under Foreign Secretary what steps had been taken by her Majesty's Government for recognising and adequately rewarding the distinguished services of those officers and men recently employed under Sir H. H. Johnstone, K.C.B., in the successful expeditions against the slave dealers in the British protectorate in Central Africa.

Mr. CURZON replied that the issue of the Central African medal had been sanctioned to the officers and men engaged in the operations from 1891 to 1894 inclusive. The issue for the operations in 1895 was now under consideration. The services of the officers of Her Majesty's regular forces had been brought before the Secretaries for War and India with a view to their being recognised as entitling them, so far as the regulations admitted, to be considered as having been mentioned in the despatches. The question of any further recognition of services in consequence of this motion was being referred to the Secretary for War.

RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. R. SOUTTAR asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of India had at present before it any project for completing the earthworks for the extension of railway beyond New Chaman to Kandahar:

Whether any communication had been made to His Highness the Amír of Afghanistan on the subject:

And, were any proposals being entertained by the Indian Government for construction of a railway from Gwadar, on the Mekran Coast, to Seistun, and to the latter place from Nushki and Chageh, on the recently demarcated Beluch-Afghan line of our extreme sphere of influence.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: So far as I am aware, neither of the projects referred to by the hon. member is under the consideration of the Government of India, nor has any communication on the subject been made to the Amír.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he would state what arrangements were being made to bring on the Indian Budget at a date when Indian matters could be properly discussed:

And, whether he would provide one day for general debate on Indian affairs on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, and one day for the discussion of the East India Accounts in Committee.

Mr. BALFOUR said he could not hold out any hope of being able to give more time than in previous years for the discussion of the Indian Budget. If the House would help the Government in their desire to facilitate business he hoped the discussion would not be thrown so late as had unfortunately been the case in some recent years.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN reminded the right hon. gentleman that the late Secretary of State (Sir H. Fowler) had intimated his intention of defending his action in regard to the cotton duties, and of criticising the action of the Government on the subject, and that this discussion would probably occupy the greater part of one night.

Mr. BALFOUR: I have not heard of that.

July 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

COST OF THE SUDAN EXPEDITION.

Mr. J. H. ROBERTS asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any information had been received from the Egyptian Government as to the expenditure already incurred in connection with the military operations in the Sudan; whether that expenditure was still being defrayed out of the ordinary revenue of Egypt; and whether it was anticipated that any proportion of the cost of the expedition, beyond the extraordinary expenses of the Indian garrison at Suakin, would have to be charged to the British Exchequer.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No information has been received from the Egyptian Government with regard to the expenditure already incurred in connection with the military operations in the Valley of the Nile. It is presumed that this expenditure is being defrayed out of the various moneys at the disposal of the Egyptian Government, including the advance of £500,000 made by the Caisse de la Dette Publique. The question as to whether any proportion of the cost of the expedition beyond what I have already stated to the House will be borne by the British Exchequer is reserved for future consideration and adjustment between the British and Egyptian Governments.

July 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. ASCROFT asked the Secretary of State for India, if he was in a position to state what effect had been given to the promise made by him, that early attention should be given to the development of India by an extension of the railways.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Since the date of the speech referred to by my hon. friend, considerable progress has been made in extending and accelerating schemes of railway construction in India, and amongst other measures, provision has been made for an expenditure during the three years ending March, 1899, of 27 crores of rupees on railway extension, a sum much in excess of the expenditure of the last three years.

In addition to this, favourable terms have been offered to the public for the further extension of Indian railways, by private agency, by the construction of branch lines forming feeders to the existing main systems. Any capital expenditure

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

in connection with such branch lines will be outside the limit of 27 crores before mentioned.

Under both these combined heads of expenditure works of construction are in progress, and a sum of about 12½ crores of rupees will have been expended on the extension of the existing Indian railway system during the present financial year.

July 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.—PETITION.

Civil Service of India.—Petition from Benares, for open competitive examinations simultaneously in England and India, presented by Sir W. Wedderburn; to lie upon the Table.

THE PROVINCIAL SERVICES.

East India (offices of Presidency Magistrate, and Judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes).—On the motion of Sir W. Wedderburn, a Return was granted for correspondence between the Government of India and Bombay and the Secretary of State for India on the subject of the exemption of the offices of Presidency Magistrate and Judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes from the operation of the rules relating to the provincial services.

TRANS-FRONTIER RAILWAYS.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether, as the distance intervening between the present terminus of the Indian railway system on the south of Afghanistan and that of the Russian railway system on the north was only about 700 miles, and Russia was now making a further extension of the Transcaspian line in the direction of Herat, her Majesty's Government would consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Afghan and Russian Governments for the construction of a line through Kandahar and Herat connecting the two systems, with a view to the completion of an overland railway to Calcutta.

Mr. CURZON: It would be quite premature at this moment to consider the expediency of entering into negotiations for the the construction of a line of railway beyond the frontiers of India to join a line that is either not yet commenced or only in the earliest stages of progress.

THE JHALAWAR CASE.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would grant a public enquiry into the case of Mahárájá of Jhalawar, in such a form that the Mahárájá might have a full opportunity of making his defence:

And, whether this enquiry would include an examination of the charges made by him against the political resident.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The decision of the Indian Government which I confirmed in a despatch of the 1st of May is final, and I have no intention of reopening this case.

THE MAHARAJA OF JHALAWAR.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House—(oh, oh)—for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance—namely, "The treatment by the Indian Government of the Mahárájá of Jhalawar and the unsatisfactory character of the enquiry into his case."

Mr. CLANCY: I rise to ask a question on a point of order. The question to which the hon. member wishes to call the attention of the House is a year old, and the decision of the Government is three months old. Can this be called a definite matter of urgent public importance—(cheers)—and can any Motion be based on it?

The SPEAKER: I have enquired into the facts, and I do not think that the hon. member has quite accurately stated the dates; I think I cannot take upon myself the responsibility of saying that this is not a matter of urgent public importance.

The pleasure of the House not having been signified, the Speaker called on those members who supported the Motion to rise in their places. There being some doubt as to whether not fewer than 40 members supported the Motion.

The SPEAKER said: I must ask hon. members to stand while being counted.

In the process of counting Mr. W. Redmond called out "Obstructing the Land Bill," followed by cries of "Order."

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is supported by more than 40 members. (Opposition cheers).

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS, who spoke amid Nationalist cries of "Divide!" and "Order!" moved "That this House do now adjourn." He said that the case was an important one, because the issue involved the principle upon which the whole constitutional question of the position of the Indian native Princes rested. He contended that when such a dispute as this occurred a native Prince ought to have some opportunity of stating his case and making a defence before an impartial tribunal. The case divided itself into four periods. The first period began in 1884 and ended in 1887. The native Prince attained his majority in 1884, and was instituted as ruler in that year. A condition affecting the Mahárájá's rule was that until he gained more experience he was to consult the Political Agent on all important matters; and the second condition was that he was not to alter or reverse any measures that passed during his minority without the concurrence of the Political Agent. The whole point therefore was whether the Mahárájá had knowingly violated any of the conditions of his rule. Some friction arose during this period, and the then Political Agent brought two or three charges against him in 1887. One was that the Prince had put the Political Agent at his left hand instead of at his right hand at the durbar. The Prince replied that he had followed well-established precedent. In September, 1887, he was deprived of his ruling powers. The next period began in 1887 and ended in 1892. In 1890 the Mahárájá wrote to the Viceroy of India that he had not knowingly broken any of the conditions, and stated that the whole matter turned on the meaning to be attached to the phrase "important matters." In 1892 Colonel Trevor recommended that the Prince be reinstated subject to three conditions—(1) control of the revenue in Agent's hands; (2) consultation on important matters with the Political Agent; (3) that measures authorised by previous Councils under Agent's administration be not altered. In 1892 the Mahárájá was reinstated, and all went well for two years. In 1894 the Prince was reinstated with full powers, and there was no condition whatever ———

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Yes there was.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: With one exception—as I was going to say, if the noble lord will allow me. In September, 1894, Colonel Trevor wrote to Calcutta, recommending that the Prince should have full powers, subject to one condition: "that he will not nominate any new members of his Council without assent of the Agent to the Governor-General of Rajputana." Major Irwin, then Political Agent at Jhalawar, pointed out that this was a condition which it would be impossible for the Prince to accept. His letter contained the phrase: "I don't suppose he will govern his State any worse than some chiefs with full powers." A letter from the Government of India to Secretary of State, dated Simla, the 11th September, 1894, stated: "With reference to Lord Kimberley's despatch, dated the 2nd March, 1893, we have the honour to report, for the information of her Majesty's Government, that, acting on the recommendation of the Governor-General's Agent in Rajputana, we have ordered the restoration of full administrative powers to His Highness Mahárájá Rana Zalim Singh of Jhalawar." The Prince was restored to full powers, subject "to keeping the Political Agent freely and fully informed as to all matters with which he ought to be acquainted." Lord Elgin wrote: "I rely upon your Highness to keep the Political Agent freely and fully informed of all the matters with which he ought to be acquainted, and it is necessary that I should add a caution that, if, unhappily, the Government of India should hereafter be unable to approve of your Highness's conduct of the administration, the present decision will be liable to reconsideration." The hon. member contended that careful perusal of Blue-book forces him to the conclusion that, as the presence and conduct of Major Wylie, as Political Agent, had led to the deprivation of the Prince's powers in 1887, so the arrival of Captain Evans Gordon led to his deposition in February, 1896. The whole point which he desired to raise

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

was that the House of Commons should see that, when charges of this kind were raised against a native prince, he ought to have the right, like other mortals, to be heard before an impartial tribunal. (Cheers.) Anyone acquainted with Oriental ideas or with India, must know how important this consideration was. The Prince, like many other princes, had the misfortune of being surrounded by unscrupulous advisers who made him their tool. In dealing with the last stage—namely, the period from 1894 to 1896—he should put the matter briefly. Captain Evans Gordon arrived as Political Agent in 1895. The correspondence between him and the Prince divided itself, naturally, into what was trifling and what was important. As to the former, he might quote a few sentences. Captain Gordon writes: "It has been reported to me that Bhawani Lal has been appointed munsarim of the stables in place of Khwajukhan. I must remind your Highness that this man was turned out of the State in 1891 by the Political Agent and Council, with the approval of the Agent to the Governor-General, and that Colonel Trevor only allowed him to return temporarily to Jhalawar in 1892. Under these circumstances, to give Bhawani Lal an appointment without consulting me constitutes a breach of the conditions laid down in His Excellency the Viceroy's kharita, under which full powers were restored to your Highness." The Prince replied: "With reference to your letter of the 26th ultimo about Bhawani Lal's appointment, I have the pleasure to say that, when I had engaged him as kamdar to Moharaniji Rathorje, I believe I verbally mentioned the fact to Mr. Irwin, and as no objection was raised against the appointment I thought in giving Bhawani Lal the stables post (in addition to his own) there would be no objection. Had I known that there existed anything against his present appointment I would not have appointed him on the stables without your consultation. But, since the man has already been dismissed from his posts and the State, I hope you will kindly think the matter fit to be dropped now." Then they read: Captain Evans Gordon wrote to me yesterday and asked me to write to you about sweetmeats that have been collected at the palace. These sweatmeats should be used as soon as possible, as they won't keep, and will very likely give rise to bowel complaints. If you have no objection I will go and see them if you appoint some one to show them to me, and advise as to their disposal." The Prince replied: "Your letter of the 14th, No. 321, about sweetmeats that are said to have been collected at the palace. In reply, I have the pleasure to say that no sweetmeats are allowed to go on accumulating. What are prepared within the two previous days are consumed on the third day, as a rule. I may say that no sweetmeats are remaining now, all having been used up already in the above-mentioned order." He would come next to the more serious charges, and one of these was the charge of the withdrawal of four and a-half lakhs from the Treasury. By the arrangement of 1894 the Prince retained full control of the revenue. In December, 1895, the Indian Government sent a very reliable official to investigate and report. This was Colonel Crosthwaite, who was met by Captain Gordon outside the camp, and there obtained a report as to the Prince's conduct. The Prince complained of this to Calcutta, that he had been subjected to insult and high-handed treatment by Captain Gordon. These were the main charges Captain Gordon wrote: "Enclosed statements were voluntarily made to me. Three of the men gave me the information on 4th January. The evidence proves that orders were issued to the troops to assemble, that ball ammunition was distributed, and that the rifles were loaded. The place of assembly was the Fatch Pultan lines, near the grass stacks and close to the agency and agent to the Governor General's camp. The movement of the troops and preparations were well-known in the town, and the matter was at once reported to me from half-a-dozen different quarters. We know that his Highness feared arrest, and it is my opinion that any supposed attempt upon him would have been resisted. It was merely a chance that some violence did not take place, for had we, who were in the tent, unwittingly done anything to harm him, his Highness would have given the signal and trouble would most likely have ensued. The Chief came to the interview with a revolver, and he was constantly looking out through the chikhs to see whether his men were there. Ahmed Shah Khan, Akram Khan's son, was seen behind the agent to the Governor General's camp, with some Vilayatis while the interview was going on, by my own office people. If it is thought necessary more evidence can be obtained, but the officers and men are very much afraid of being left to the mercy of the Chief, and it is remarkable that any of them should dare to come forward. It is believed that all their names are in the possession of his Highness, and that he intends taking some measures to make them deny what they have said." Then Colonel Crosthwaite wrote: "On the 31st I had a letter sent to his Highness asking him to come and see me. He at first declined to see me unless I paid him a ceremonial visit. He then said he would come if I assured him that at the interview he would not be arrested and deported to Benares. I replied that he would at the conclusion of the visit be allowed to leave in the usual manner, and that, if his Excellency the Viceroy were to order his arrest, the arrest would be made publicly and not by inviting him to visit me in my tent. I also told him that I had been directed to warn him of the serious nature of the case against him, and to invite from him an expression of what he had to say in explanation or extenuation. After receiving this letter his Highness came and saw me. He had a revolver in his belt. The Political Agent and Captain Impey, the First Assistant, were present at the interview. His Highness's attitude was unfriendly and uncompromising, and he appeared to be very angry. He refused to shake hands with Captain Evans-Gordon. He steadily maintained that he was right in what he had done. The Viceroy had given him full powers and he had a full right to exercise those powers without interference. He had not, in his opinion, done anything contrary to the injunctions contained in his Excellency's kharita. With regard to his dealings with the Political Agent, he said that he was not to blame, he had been very good friends until Captain Gordon had shaken his fist in his (his Highness's) face, and told him to accept a certain official's resignation. I told his Highness that I considered his action in sending away his Dewan and some other officials just before my visit was wrong; that his Highness was bound, in accordance with the Viceroy's instructions, to furnish all material information, and that sending away the Dewan so that he should not speak to me was a violation of those instructions. His Highness said that he had sent the Dewan off on State business, and had done nothing unusual or contrary to the Viceroy's orders. I must mention that on the 30th December I wrote to the Maharaj Rana, objecting to his sending away the Dewan, to whom I wished to speak on State matters, and requesting his Highness to recall that officer to Patan. To that he replied, 'I do not think I ought knowingly to allow him (the Dewan) to speak against me behind my back with the object of promoting his desires and to increase the present difficulties.' He concluded by requesting me to put in writing any questions I wanted to put to the Dewan, and he (his Highness) would get his written reply. No attention was paid to my request for the recall of the Dewan, and on the 31st of December I wrote to his Highness and told him that I should like to see the Dewan on the 1st of January. His Highness replied that he had sent the Dewan off to a place 60 miles away, and he could not return within the time required." The Mahárájá's reply to the charges was: "In regard to the insults, hardships and high handed treatment to which I have been and am still subjected, although I wanted to send full particulars in a separate kharita, giving full and proper proofs, but I was ill, and while not yet fully restored to health, preparations were made to send troops against me, under the orders of the Political Agent and the Agent to the Governor General without any cause. Cavalry from Agar and troops and sowers from Deoli were sent for without any cause, and I have further heard that more troops have been ordered from Deoli. In accordance with the desire of the Political Agent of Bakhshi—namely, Paymaster and Commander-in-Chief of the troops, who was an old servant of the State, had been ordered to be dismissed without cause, and Bhawani Singhji, who is the son of a Jagirdar, and my mortal enemy, who declares falsely that he is the heir of the 'Gadi,' but in reality he is not the heir, because if he or his family had been the heir, why should the late Mahárájá Prithi Rajji have called me from Kathiawar and made me his heir, has been appointed 'Bakhshi' of the army. From the date of his appointment, at the suggestion of the Political Agent, he has been fabricating false evidence about the distribution of cartridges, by tempting some of the men in the army, by holding out hopes to them of promotion of rank and increase of salary, and by threatening others with bad treatment and harm. He has got together about 10 to 11 men, who by his inducement, having sold their faith merely

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

for the sake of their own welfare, or from fear of ill-treatment and harm are giving such false account of distribution of cartridges as cannot be even reasonably entertained or imagined. He causes it to be written down and then attested at the Agency. Daily men, most of whom have been punished, are called to the Agency, and their statements are written down. No attention is paid to the statements of those men who, fearing God and having regard to their conscience, decline to make false statements about the distribution of cartridges, and object that this had no foundation at all; nor is their statement taken down. I beg to bring to your Excellency's notice the fraudulent and deceitful proceedings of this man, and request that your Excellency out of kindness and a sense of justice will not take into your consideration their fabricated evidence and artful proceedings. I hope that no attention will be paid to their *ex parte* and false proceedings, otherwise I shall be unjustly subjected to great oppression, and Government after becoming aware of the true circumstances, which I am ready to prove, will have cause for regret. As for myself, I beg to state that I have neither done anything wrong nor intend to do so, and that I have done nothing but remain silent and carry out orders. The relatives of the Agency establishments have spread a report that the Dewan has been promised by the Political Agent that if he can get a Superintendency established, he (Political Agent) will become Agent there, and will make him Vice-President of the Council. On this account the Dewan of the State, the Political Agent and Kunwar Bhawani Singh have induced most of the army and other officials of the State to bring about mismanagement of the affairs of the State. In short they have induced them to act in opposition me, to and have thus subjected me to severe oppression. They have given such exaggerated accounts of my proceedings, that I am in fear of my life. They have so disappointed those men, who do not wish to act against me, that they are ready to leave service and go away. Even the English-knowing head clerk, who was in my service, was so much threatened that he resigned his appointment. Now I have nobody who knows English. I have therefore had to write this kharita in Urdu. As, in consideration of my good-will, I consider myself to be under the care and protection of Government, I have therefore given this brief account of my circumstances in the hope of obtaining justice. I trust that mercy will be speedily shown to me, so that my life may be saved, and all the high-handed treatment to which I have been subjected at the instance of the Political Agent under the advice of the Agent to the Governor General, and to which I may be subjected in future, may be put a stop to with the utmost promptitude." There was another important point he had to make, and that was that the Prince had expressed a strong desire to have a Commission of Inquiry into his case. On February 12, 1896, he wrote to the Viceroy: "I request that a commission may be appointed to make enquiries, and the members should be such as have no connection with the Rajputana Presidency." Was not that a reasonable request to make? In reply to that request the Government of India wrote: "The demand for a commission made by the Maharaj Rana overlooks the true issue. The Government of India, as the paramount power, are bound in their dealings with native States to hold the scales equal, and, while they secure the Chief in the exercise of the powers that belong to him, to protect his subjects from misgovernment by their misuse. Where it is necessary for the Government of India to interfere to secure good government, they must act on their responsibility and by the advice of their accredited agents, and can delegate their functions to no other authority or tribunal." He agreed with every word of that reply. The Government of India must "hold the scales equal" between the native rulers and the agents of Great Britain who reside with them.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE: That reply had reference to the relations between native chiefs and their subjects, and not to the relations between native chiefs and the officers of the Indian Government.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS said he was dealing with the principle contained in the demand of the Maháráj. He did not overlook the issue, because the scales could not be held equally between the parties to a dispute unless an opportunity of being heard was given to each party. "The Government of India must act on their own responsibility, and not delegate their functions to other tribunals." He quite agreed with that, but the Government were not asked to delegate their functions. They were only asked to hear both sides before coming to a decision. This principle was vital to the issue. Colonel Crosthwaite himself seemed to admit that, before the facts could be really understood and judged upon, a formal enquiry must be held. On this point he would direct the noble lord's attention to a paragraph in a letter of Colonel Crosthwaite in which the Prince was deposed, in which he said: "Without holding a formal enquiry it is impossible to say whether he speaks the truth."

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: What is Colonel Crosthwaite's own opinion?

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: He said, "I do not believe it;" but that did not affect the point. The noble lord said that the decision arrived at in February last was final, and could not be reopened. He hoped, however, that the result of this discussion would be to cause the noble lord to reconsider the matter, and to give the Maháráj Rana some further and adequate opportunity of stating his case and defending his action. He did not desire to ask the House of Commons to pass judgment on either party. That was a matter for the Indian Government. But he did claim that the Imperial Parliament had a right to lay down the principle on which the Indian Government should act, and to say that, when such serious charges were made by a political agent against a native Prince, the latter should have an opportunity of defending himself before judgment was passed. Great interest was taken in this matter throughout India. The Indian press without exception was loud in protesting against what had occurred. The English press, without distinction of party, joined in demanding a fair hearing for the Rájá, and he believed that in pleading his cause he was but advocating a principle which was vital, in his opinion, to the continuance of those relations of goodwill and confidence between Great Britain and the Empire of India on which the welfare of the two countries depended.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN seconded the Motion. He said he wished to refer chiefly to two points, namely, the importance of this matter and the necessity of giving the Rájá an impartial trial. It had been said by the political officers that these proceedings were being very closely watched all over Rajputana. But he went further and said that the proceedings were being watched by every ruling Chief throughout India, not only with interest, but with anxiety and alarm. How could that fail to be the case when they saw one of their number deprived of his throne and exiled from his dominions, not for any maladministration proved in public enquiry, but upon the secret reports of the political agent who was on bad terms with the Prince himself. Our position in India depended very much on the goodwill of the native Chiefs. At the time of the Mutiny they were our sheet-anchor, and those who took an interest in our Imperial fortunes should be especially careful to remove all causes of unrest and alarm among the native Chiefs of India. He did not say there were not cases in which the Government of India ought to interfere—cases in which maladministration and tyranny were proved. In such cases it was not only the right but the duty of the Indian Government to interfere. He agreed entirely with the view that it was to the paramount Power alone that the inhabitants of native States should look for protection against misgovernment and tyranny; but what he contended for was that in this case no tyranny and no oppression had been proved against the Chief in question. He maintained that this was a personal quarrel, and that the charges of maladministration were somewhat of an afterthought. It was the misfortune of our political system in India that in every native State there were two kings, the Rájá on the one hand, who gathered around him the supporters of the "ins", and the Political Agent, on the other hand, who gathered around him every faction who might be termed the "outs." The only story the Government of India heard was the story told by the Political Agent, whose only source of information was the faction whose very object it was to discredit the Rájá. His proposition was that this Prince had not had an impartial trial, because all the information on which the Government of India had acted was one-sided information, obtained from a tainted source. Such being the case, he was entitled to a fair and impartial hearing before the very serious step of deposing him was taken. The correspondence showed that there was

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

no real popular discontent. All the signs of popular discontent were wanting. What were the charges of misgovernment? The only thing he saw charged in the nature of maladministration had reference to the revenue settlement, and the remarkable part of that accusation was, not that the Rájá had taken too much from his subjects, but the statement of the agent absolutely was that he did not take enough. He only wished that the people of British India could make that charge against their Government. Another complaint was that the Rájá cut down expenses. Again, he could only wish that the Government of India would do the same thing, and so get rid of a great deal of objectionable taxation. The reports of the political officer did not lay any great stress on acts of maladministration. The Government of India practically gave away the whole case by saying that the question before them had been not so much specific acts of maladministration by the Rájá himself as his attitude towards the British Government. The whole case had arisen out of a quarrel between the political agency and the Rájá, and what was asked was that there should be an impartial enquiry. He had no special knowledge of this particular chief but it was in the interests of all the chiefs, and because he believed there was no more important thing for our rule in India than to cultivate and retain the goodwill and friendship of the native chiefs that he seconded this motion

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said that he could not question the right of the hon. gentleman to make exceptional use of the forms of the House to call attention to this question; but he thought everyone in the House would admit that he had chosen a singularly inopportune time. These papers had been in the hands of the House for some time past, and the matter might have been raised last week or the week before, next week or the week after, without in the least degree affecting the hon. member's case. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member had deliberately selected a day specially apportioned to the discussion of an important Bill in which many hon. gentlemen took a great interest. The question which the House wished to discuss was more or less limited by time, and if a motion of this kind was made in order to obtain a great slice of the time of the House for one day it was more or less an indirect attempt to kill that measure. (Hear, hear.) He thought he could demolish the whole of the hon. gentleman's case in half-a-dozen minutes. It was a matter of great surprise to him that two hon. gentlemen should read the Blue-book with such blind eyes. Every little detail in favour of the Mahárájá had been paraded before the House, but the main facts on which his deposition was based had altogether escaped their notice. He was the adopted son of the ruler of a small State created by the Indian Government, and on the death of his adopted father he was sent to a college at Rajputana. During the time he was a minor his State was governed by a native Council, under the superintendence of the Political Agent. The result of that was that the State greatly improved in prosperity, and the people became habituated to good government and administration. When he arrived at his majority the Indian Government only allowed him to undertake the functions of government on the condition that he did not attempt to upset the principles of government in force during his minority, and that in all cases of material importance he should consult the Political Agent. It was said that there was a personal quarrel between him and the Political Agent, but there had not been a single Government during the last fifteen years who had not come into collision with him, or a solitary Political Agent who had not had occasion to report him. The first Political Agent was Sir Edward Bradford, the present Chief Commissioner of Police, and all who knew him would say that he was a model Political Agent, combining firmness with a courtesy and charm of manner which was seldom to be found. The Mahárájá had not been two years discharging the functions of his State before Sir Edward Bradford had to report him as almost hopeless. He did all he could to keep him straight, but the young man disregarded his advice, and the only alternative seemed to be to depose him. The Indian Government declined to adopt that step, but considerably reduced his powers and addressed to him a very severe warning. That was under Lord Dufferin. The succeeding Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne, had attention called to his conduct, and had to address to him a still stronger caution, pointing out that it might be necessary to remove him outside the State. This apparently had some effect upon him, and to a certain extent he became more amenable to advice, and shortly afterwards he was allowed to discharge some of the functions he had previously enjoyed. Later on, as he seemed more disposed to act on advice and to carry on his government on proper lines Colonel Irwin, the then Political Agent, recommended that he might be given the full powers he originally had. The one mistake was clearly the granting of those powers, because the moment he had them he lapsed back into his old habits. Captain Evans Gordon then appeared on the scene, and finding malpractices going on in every branch of the administration, protested against it. The Mahárájá then deliberately tried to bribe Captain Evans Gordon, and, the attempt being exposed, refrained from offering any apology to the Political Agent. The Prince took as his confidential adviser a native advocate who had been struck off the rolls, and the agent complained, the day after, that every form of maladministration was practised, he himself being boycotted, and people who had obtained access to him being dismissed. Altogether the Prince showed himself to be an impossible ruler, and in the end his deposition became absolutely necessary. He himself admitted that it was necessary most scrupulously to guard the rights and privileges of Indian princes. (Hear, hear.) At the present moment he was glad to say the relations between those princes and the Indian Government were most cordial. Through the assistance and advice of the political agents, we had to discharge a most difficulty duty. The administration of the native States was steadily improving, but, just as we had a duty towards the native princes, so had the Indian Government a duty towards the people who lived in the native States. We had taken from them the means of revolution, and we were, therefore, bound to prevent misgovernment. In the present instance, the Prince had refused to comply with the conditions on which alone we could accept his authority, and as he had set the Indian Government at defiance his deposition could not be avoided.

Mr. CLANCY rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

The SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that question.

Dr. CLARK said the only charge of maladministration against this Prince was that he had attempted bribery, but it was clear from the Blue-book that the attempt had been made, not by the Mahárájá of Jhalawar, but by a Bengali Babu, who had been dismissed by the Resident and who had offered the new agent 15,000 rupees if he would refrain from further action against him. He protested against the Prince having been deposed without being heard in his own defence. Not a single fact showed, directly or indirectly, that the Mahárájá was a party to bribery. He thought there was plenty of territory already under the Crown, and that those native states should be kept for the development of native statesmanship.

Mr. H. J. WILSON said he was inclined to agree with the Secretary for India that this young man was a rather difficult person to deal with; and he thought it was hardly wise to invest a youth of 18, straight from college, with such powers. It seemed to him most important that the native princes should understand more clearly than they did the circumstances under which they were liable to be deposed. He had had the honour of being a member of the Royal Commission on Opium. A good deal of evidence was laid before it as to the rights the Government of India claimed to exercised over the native princes. He found———

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. gentleman would not be in order in going into the general question of the relation between the Indian Government and the native princes. He must confine himself to the question of the deposition of the Mahárájá.

Mr. H. J. WILSON said he was merely going to point out that it was only on certain specified grounds of invalid administration that the native princes were interfered with. Neither in the papers presented to the House nor in the statement of the noble lord the Secretary for India was there any evidence of maladministration, cruelty, or injustice against the Mahárájá. It was to a large extent a question of jealousy, of good manners or bad manners, and of a personal quarrel between the Political Resident and this young man.

Captian NORTON rose to continue the Debate.

The FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman was about to withdraw his Motion?

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS: Yes, sir; in the circumstances, I beg to ask leave to withdraw the Motion.

The Motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

July 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MADRAS PRESIDENCY EVICTIONS, ETC.

East India (Madras Presidency, Evictions),—Return (presented 11th June) to be printed. (No. 313.)

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII. Parliamentary Report No. 7. SEPTEMBER, 1896.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from July 28th to August 14th.

Imperial Parliament.

July 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BENGAL GAOLS.

East India (Bengal Gaols). On the motion of Mr. HENRY J. WILSON a Return was granted of "Reports of Committee appointed to enquire into the Sanitary Condition of certain Gaols in Bengal."

THE ABKARI DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the Abkari Department at Bombay had granted a licence for a new liquor shop in Sleater Road (a part of Bombay where there had not previously been any such shop), notwithstanding that an influentially signed protest had been forwarded from residents in that neighbourhood:

Whether granting a licence under such circumstances was at variance with the declared policy of the Indian Government as expressed in the despatches of the Secretary of State, No. 28, of 19th April, 1888, and No. 31, of 14th March, 1889, and of the Government of India, No. 157, of 25th May, 1889, and No. 29, of 4th February, 1890:

Whether the police interested themselves in discouraging opposition on the part of the inhabitants:

Whether the licensee had rendered useful service to the police during the Bombay riots:

And, whether facilitating the grant of this licence was in the nature of a reward for such services.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no official information as to the matters to which the hon. member alludes; but it is the practice of the Department, before new shops are opened, to ascertain the wishes of the local residents.

THE INDIAN TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Sir CHARLES DILKE asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it would be necessary to obtain a vote in the present Session for British expenditure in connexion with the Sudan expedition or despatch of Indian troops to Suakin, or whether it was the intention of the Government to defer asking for such a vote until next Session.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, I do not expect to be in a position to propose such a vote this Session.

July 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET: PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Accounts and Estimates, 1896-7), Copy presented of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India (by Command); to lie upon the Table.

THE MADRAS REGIMENTS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the under officering of Madras infantry regiments, and whether he was aware that it had gone to such an extent that lately, for a brigade parade, the commanding officer had only available three officers for two regiments:

Whether he would cause enquiries to be made into the cause of the constant depletion of Madras regiments by transfer of officers, and its effects on the efficiency and morale of the corps, and the best way of providing a remedy:

And, whether any representations had been made to the Indian Government by commanding officers on this subject; and what, if any, explanations had been offered or steps taken in the matter.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have heard nothing of the statements to which my hon. friend's question relates, but I will enquire of the Government of India.

DISEASE AMONG EUROPEAN TROOPS.

Major RASCH asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the fact, as stated by the Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of India in his Report for 1894, that 3,062 men were constantly ineffective from venereal disease:

And, how, on an emergency, the Government would propose to replace them in the ranks.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have observed with regret the reported increase in the average number of European troops disabled at one time from this cause. I am not aware of any means by which they could be replaced on an emergency.

MADRAS CITY COURT.

Mr. W. F. LAWRENCE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Home authorities had put pressure on the Government of Madras to raise the jurisdiction of the City Civil Court from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 5,000:

Whether the Madras Government stated that this extension of jurisdiction was open to objections, and that the High Court was itself equally divided in opinion on the merits of the question:

And, whether he was aware that the Chamber of Commerce and other commercial and legal opinion was opposed to the change; and, if so, whether they purposed still to urge the change he pressed forward.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is true that, after full consideration of the views expressed by the Government of Madras and by the Chambers of Commerce, I requested the Government of Madras, in a despatch dated 19th March, 1896, to take an

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

opportunity of raising the jurisdiction of the City Court to Rs. 5,000, unless they saw any strong reason to the contrary. To this despatch I have as yet received no reply.

RATES OF WAGES IN BOMBAY AND MADRAS.

Mr. KENYON asked the Secretary of State for India if he would get for the House statistics as to rates of wages paid, and hours worked, in the cotton trade in Bombay and Madras.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Wages in India are usually paid by the piece, and vary according to the season of the year. The fullest information that I possess on this subject, and as to the hours of labour (which are limited by law) is contained in the Factory Reports for Bombay and Madras, copies of which I shall be happy to supply to my hon. friend if he wishes it.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE "EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM" DELAYED.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India when the explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State on the East India Accounts and Estimates would be distributed to members:

And, whether there was any reason for the delay this year in the distribution.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Memorandum is now ready, the last figures having been received from India by the mail just arrived.

The delay in preparation is due to pressure of the work in the Financial Department owing to the mass of information required by the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure.

July 31st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. SOUTTAR asked the Secretary of State for India with regard to the proposals recently pressed on the Marquis of Salisbury by an influential deputation of the Chambers of Commerce, for railway extension on the east and north-east of Burma, in what direction and how near to the frontiers of south-west China it was desired to project such railway system:

And, whether the concessions recently granted to the Rothschild Railway Syndicate included powers to construct these proposed lines on the frontiers of Eastern Burma.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A line of railway is now in course of construction, starting from the Burmese Railway system, near Mandalay, and terminating near the western borders of China, at a point called Kunlon Ferry on the Salween River.

This agreement with the new Burma Railway Co. gives powers to the Government of India to call upon the Company under specified conditions, to construct such extensions of the Burmese railway system within the frontiers of Burma as Government may think desirable.

RAILWAY TRAFFIC RETURNS.

Mr. SOUTTAR asked the Secretary of State for India whether an estimate could be given of the extent of the diminution which certain Indian railways had of late suffered in their traffic returns:

And, whether it could be said how far the diminution was attributable to the drought and how far to causes of a more permanent nature.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The latest returns show a decrease of 619,950 tens of rupees in the gross earnings of Indian railways from the 1st January to 6th June, 1896, as compared with the corresponding period in 1895.

This decrease is attributable to short crops and some consequent scarcity; but not, so far as I am aware, to causes of a permanent nature.

THE INVASION OF KAFIRISTAN.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the India Office had received a copy of the letter from the Amír of Afghanistan of the 4th December, 1895, referred to in Paragraph 4 of the despatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State dated Simla, 22nd April, 1896:

Whether he had received the information asked for in his despatch of 17th April respecting military operations and the fate of the tribes in Kafiristan:

And, whether he would lay all the correspondence referring to Kafiristan on the Table of the House before the rising of Parliament.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A copy of the Amír's letter referred to has been received at the India Office, but it relates to other matters besides that referred to in the passage quoted, and it would not be in the public interest to lay it on the Table.

My despatch of the 17th April was crossed by the letter from the Government of India of the 22nd idem. No subsequent reply has been received from the Government of India.

There is no further correspondence relating to Kafiristan which I can lay on the Table.

August 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BOMBAY SMALL CAUSE COURT.

East India (Offices of Presidency Magistrate and Judge of the Presidency Court of Small Causes)—Return [presented 1st August] to be printed. [No. 327.]

August 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

GIRL OFFENDERS.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Indian Reformatory Schools Act, 1876, did not provide for the confinement of girls, but only for boys:

Whether a recent Gazette of India published the draft of an amending Act which however makes no provision for young female offenders:

Whether young female offenders were confined in jails where they were obliged to associate with professional thieves and other adult criminals:

And, whether he could take some steps to ameliorate this condition of affairs.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: It is the case that neither the Act nor the amending Bill contain any provision for young female offenders. Such offenders, if sentenced to imprisonment, can only be accommodated in the wards set aside for female convicts. The number of young female offenders is very small, and it may be doubted whether many of the Local Governments are in a position to provide separate reformatories for them; but a proposal to enable this to be done is before the Select Committee to which the amending Bill has been referred, and I will also send out the hon. member's question and this answer for their consideration.

PASTEUR INSTITUTE.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for India if he would explain whether the Government of India were officially promoting the foundation there of a Pasteur Institute, or whether the Indian Medical Department was doing so; and, if so, by whose authority.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have no information later than 1894, when the Government of India reported that they had promised, subject to certain conditions, the services of a medical officer to the Pasteur Institute, which they explained was quite distinct from any Government Department.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Mr. MACLEAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury when he proposed to take the Indian Budget.

Mr. BALFOUR: It cannot evidently be taken before the middle of next week.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

August 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BENGAL GAOLS.

East India (Bengal Gaols).—Return presented relative thereto [Address 28th July; Mr. Henry J. Wilson] to lie upon the Table.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, whether he could now state on what day the Indian Budget would be taken.

Mr. BALFOUR said the House would probably be asked to consider the Indian Budget on Friday next week.

August 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

Bijai Bahadur Singh.—Petition from Mahdo Prasad, for enquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

LEAVE AND PENSION RULES.

East India (Leave and Pension Rules of the Civil (Uncovenanted) Service).—Return presented relative thereto (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 168, of Session 1892) [Address 3rd August; Mr. Barnes] to lie upon the Table.

EUROPEAN TROOPS IN INDIA.

Major RASCH asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he would consider the advisability of appointing a Committee, next Session, to enquire into the working of the Contagious Diseases Acts with reference to the British army quartered in India.

Mr. JAMES STUART asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention had been called to the views repeatedly expressed by the Army Sanitary Commission, that the system of the Contagious Diseases Acts in India had proved a failure, and that its reinstitution could not consequently be advocated on sanitary grounds; and whether, considering these views and the strong opposition which existed to such measures on moral grounds, the Government would direct the attention of the Indian authorities to the memoranda on the subject by the Army Sanitary Commission and to the remedial measures suggested by them.

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY: In answer to the question on the Paper, and that of the hon. gentleman opposite, I have to say that there is no doubt as to the gravity of the present state of things. We understand that there is a dispute whether, and how far, this state of things is due to recent legislation. The Government will consider the propriety of an enquiry, either by Committee or otherwise, to decide the controversy as to the facts.

August 10th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORTED SALE OF BURMESE RAILWAYS.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE asked the Secretary of State for India, if he could state the facts connected with the reported sale of Burmese railways by the Government of India to a syndicate:

And, if one of those conditions included a Government guarantee of interest on the stock of those railways.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No sale of the Burmese Railways has taken place or was ever contemplated. A company has been formed under agreement with the Secretary of State in Council, and with the concurrence of the Government of India, for working the existing system and making extensions. On the capital raised by the Company, interest at 2½ per cent. is guaranteed by the Government.

THE BENGAL TENANCY ACT.

Mr. BARNES asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the leading article of the *Pioneer* of 16th July, 1896, in which it was stated that chaos had supervened in the relations between landlord and tenant throughout Bengal by reason of certain recent decisions under the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1885:

Whether it was true, as stated by the *Pioneer*, that the ruling of the full bench of the High Court of Bengal in the case of Upadhay Thakoor showed that for some years past some of the highest executive officers in Bengal, drawing pay of Rs. 2,000 per mensem and upwards, had been employed under the Bengal Tenancy Act in exercising an illegal jurisdiction:

Whether it was true, as stated by the same authority, that some hundreds of thousands of decisions in recent rent and boundary cases had been invalidated by that ruling:

And, whether he would lay all the Papers upon the Table of the House of Commons before assenting to any extension of the provisions of the Bengal Tenancy Act, or any further alteration in the land laws of Bengal.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have seen the article in the *Pioneer* to which my hon. friend alludes, but I have no official information on the subject of the recent working of the Bengal Tenancy Act. I will, however, make enquiries on the subject.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

On the motion of Lord G. HAMILTON it was agreed that the Indian Budget should be put down upon the order paper for Wednesday.

The SPEAKER said that hon. members who intended to put down amendments would ballot for them to-morrow.

Sir H. FOWLER: Is it the intention of the Government to take the Indian Budget on Wednesday?

Lord G. HAMILTON: No.

August 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

KYTHAL STATE.—PETITION.

State of Kythal.—Petition from Cis Sutlej, for enquiry; to lie upon the Table.

HOSPITALS AT ADEN.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received any reply to the reference made last April to the Government of India relative to the provision of a trained nursing staff for hospitals at Aden; and, if a reply was received, would he state what provision was intended to be made.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: No reply has been received from the Government of India. I have requested that the report regarding the medical arrangements at Aden may be expedited.

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India whether the enquiry regarding applications for concessions for the building of railways under the scheme promulgated by the Government of India in 1893 which he had instituted was complete:

And, if he would place upon the Table of the House at an early date the Return promised by him on 19th June last.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The promised enquiry was duly made by a letter addressed to the Government of India on the 26th June, but sufficient time has not yet elapsed for receipt of a reply.

As soon as the Return is received it will be laid upon the Table.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AND INDIAN FINANCE.

PROPOSAL FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, with a view to a more systematic and effectual consideration of Indian finance by this House, he would favourably consider a proposal to appoint each year a Select Com-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

mittee of the House to examine and report upon the East India accounts.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Any effective annual examination of the accounts of the Government of India by a Select Committee sitting in this country would raise many grave difficulties, would seriously interfere with the administrative work of the Government of India, and would entail upon the revenues of India an expense which the results would in no sense justify. I cannot therefore hold out any hope of assenting to any such proposition.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked whether the noble lord thought that the present arrangements did not admit of improvement.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said that he would have an opportunity of referring to this subject in introducing the Indian Budget. The control exercised over the East India accounts was, as far as he knew, a singularly effective control.

THE BENGAL TENANCY ACT.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of Bengal had submitted any proposals for amending the law of landlord and tenant in Bengal as settled by the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1885:

And, whether any opportunity would be afforded to the landlords and tenants of the province to represent their views regarding the provisions of the Act of 1885 before any fresh legislation on the subject was proceeded with.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have received no official information as to any proposals to amend the Bengal Tenancy Act; but, as stated yesterday in answer to a similar question, I am enquiring of the Government of India as to the recent working of the Act.

Should any fresh legislation be necessary, persons interested will undoubtedly have an opportunity of placing their views before the Government of India.

August 12th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Sanitary Measures).—Copy presented of Report on Sanitary Measures in India 1894-5, vol. xxviii. [by command] to lie upon the Table.

East India (Statistical Abstract).—Copy presented of Statistical Abstract relating to British India from 1885-6 to 1894-5, Thirtieth Number [by command] to lie upon the Table.

August 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LORD WELBY'S COMMISSION.
PRELIMINARY REPORT.
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, &c.

Administration of the Expenditure of India (Royal Commission).—Copy presented of Preliminary Report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the administration and management of the Military and Civil Expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India; and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested; together with Minutes of Evidence and Appendices [by command] to lie upon the Table.

THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether a large portion of the Indian contingent sent to garrison Suakin has been sent on to act as a convict guard at Tokar, an Egyptian convict station some seventy miles from Suakin, where the climate was intensely hot, water very scarce, and food indifferent, and whether the Commanding Officer and second in command of this force had both been invalided within a month:

And, would he place before the House before it rose reports from the General commanding the Indian contingent and from the chief sanitary authority under the Egyptian Government as to the general health and condition of her Majesty's forces forming the Indian contingent.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A battalion of Native Infantry and a squadron of Native Cavalry have been sent to Tokar, not as a guard for the convict prison but to garrison that port, as the position is one of great strategical importance for the defence of the Suakin district as was shown by the fighting in its vicinity in 1885. The climate is very hot, but the health of the troops and followers at Suakin and Tokar is reported to be very good, and that of the European officers generally good; but out of seventy officers at Suakin and Tokar four have been invalided, including the Officer in Command at Tokar. There is a sufficient supply of water at Tokar, and the food supplies are ample. Every precaution is being taken to make the condition of the troops holding this important position as comfortable as is possible.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES IN INDIA.
PROMISED ENQUIRY.

General Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the state of the British Army in India, as reported by the *Times* correspondent at Calcutta, in their issue of the 11th inst., wherein it was stated that nearly 4,000 men were in hospital from preventable contagious diseases, and that the state of the Army was getting worse day by day:

Whether the attention of her Majesty's Government was to be seriously drawn to this matter during the coming recess:

And, whether he was now prepared to state to the House that during the coming recess, in conjunction with Lord Lansdowne and the Govenor-General of India, steps would be taken for an enquiry, either by Royal Commission or by Select Committee of that House, with a view to taking measures that might, once for all, as regarded that painful matter, place the British Army in India in that state of efficiency in which the people of this country and of India desired to see it, and to bring about which they paid some twenty-five millions of money every year.

Mr. JAMES STUART asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the various memoranda of the Army Sanitary Commission and to the following conclusions which they state: "The facts, so far as we can ascertain them, lead us to the conclusion that a compulsory lock hospital system in India has proved a failure, and that its reinstitution cannot consequently be advocated on sanitary grounds. We believe that the best practicable means of diminishing the prevalence of these diseases is to be found in establishing a system of voluntary lock hospitals and in providing the soldier as far as possible with healthy occupation and recreation;" and whether any steps had been recently taken to bring those views before the cantonment authorities or to carry them into effect.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I have seen the statement in the *Times* to which my hon. friend (Sir H. Havelock-Allan) refers.

As stated by the Right Hon. the First Lord of the Treasury on Friday last, in reply to questions by the hon. members for Essex (S.E.) and Hoxton, Her Majesty's Government will consider the propriety of some enquiry, to decide whether the alleged increase of disease is correct.

In reply to a further question from the hon. member for Hoxton, of which he has given me private notice, I may add that I am aware of the opinions recorded by the Army Sanitary Commission on this subject; but what I want to ascertain is not the opinion of individuals, even when acting officially, but the facts relating to the health of the Army.

General Sir H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN: May I ask whether her Majesty's Government propose to institute an enquiry by Royal Commission or a Select Committee of this House?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I should not like to commit myself to the exact form which the enquiry will take; what I think is an enquiry by a small number of impartial persons would be best. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE asked whether the enquiry would be here or in India?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The enquiry will take place here.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

PENSIONS IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MACLURE asked the Secretary of State for India if he would explain why the small extra pensions for which Chief Engineers and Superintending Engineers in the Public Works Department had hitherto been eligible, had recently been withdrawn by the orders of the India Office:

Whether any despatch ordering a curtailment of the privileges of officers of long service could have a retrospective effect, or could take effect before such despatch was publicly gazetted:

And, if all the correspondence on this subject could be laid upon the Table of the House.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The exceptional pensions, which were sanctioned in 1883, are not to be granted in the Public Works Department in future, because the special circumstances which were then held to justify them no longer exist.

The despatch does not affect any officers who were already in the Service at the time when it was written; and the case of those who may have entered since that date, but before its publication, has been provided for.

The correspondence relating to the discontinuance of further grants of these pensions is contained in the Return recently laid on the Table.

THE "BUDGET" DEBATE.

LORD G. HAMILTON ON "INFINITE BENEFITS" AND "INFINITESIMAL DRAWBACKS."

On the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts,

Lord G. HAMILTON said, I think it will be for the general convenience of the House if I make my statement relating to the finances of India before you, Sir, leave the chair. In taking this course I am following several precedents which occured in former years when the Secretary of State found himself in a position similar to that which I occupy. On the notice paper there are three amendments which, though all relating to matters of importance, are purely academic in character; and as the House has met for the purpose of discussing Indian finance I think it will be more convenient to devote ourselves to that purpose than to wait for the motions on the paper. When last year I had the honour of making a statement on behalf of the Indian Government, I was able to lay before the House a statement which I think was in most respects more satisfactory than at that time I thought to be possible. I accompanied that statement with an indication that, in my private opinion, signs were not wanting to show that during the ensuing months there would be a further improvement in Indian finance. I am glad that anticipation has been more than realized, and the figures and statement I am about to make would be eminently satisfactory if they could only be detached from the unfortunate consequences of erratic exchange; but unfortunately right through my statement every year the fluctuations of exchange value have left their mark on the finance of the year. I wish to impress this fact on the House. They must discount the favourable character of the figures which I lay before them in the knowledge that a large proportion of the figures are based on a valuation which is necessarily shifting. There is a techinal matter to dispose of before I enter into a detailed examination of the accounts. The form of the account adopted in the explanatory memorandum laid on the Table of the House is based on the accounts which my predecessor prepared in the belief that a return of net income and net expenditure could be made to give a clearer idea of the actual financial position than can be gathered from the old gross returns, which under statute have to be laid on the Table of the House. The tables in the explanatory memorandum are prepared on that basis, but it will be seen that for the most part they are divided between Imperial and Provincial transactions. In order to stimulate an interest in the development of income the Provincial Governments are allowed the revenue in certain proportions, varying according to the particular head; and they have to meet therefrom the expenditure under specified heads in certain proportions. If their revenue exceeds their expenditure they are allowed to add the surplus to their balances, which are available for expenditure in subsequent years; on the other hand, if their revenue falls short of their expenditure they must make the deficiency good out of their balances. Thus, the provincial receipts and charges exactly balance one another; and, while it may be of interest under any particular head to examine the total receipt or charge, the improvement or deterioration of the surplus and of the general financial position depends on the extent to which the Imperial accounts alone are affected. The first year I have to deal with is the closing of the accounts of the year 1894-95. Sir James Westland originally estimated for a deficiency of Rx. 301,900, but I am glad to say that the accounts show a surplus of Rx. 693,110. But it is satisfactory to note that the real improvement is considerably greater. In the course of this year a material addition was made to the charges by not bringing up the Famine Insurance Fund to a higher point than that at which it originally stood. Those conversant with Indian finance know that it was established by Sir John Strachey in 1881, and it amounted to a sum of Rx. 1,500,000 annually to be put on one side out of revenue for the purposes of famine, and he fixed upon the figure of Rx. 1,500,000 in the following manner. He took the total expenditure upon famine during the past ten years and divided it by ten. I am glad to say that from that time until now we have not had a single serious famine to deal with in India, and the Government came to the conclusion that, looking to the fact that the danger from famine had largely diminished, they might fix the Famine Insurance Fund at Rx. 1,000,000. This fund under financial exigency has been largely reduced, and the amount originally taken in the estimates of this year was only Rx. 445,000. The difference of Rx. 555,000 has to be added to the surplus, and, taking these two together, the total surplus as against deficiency is Rx. 1,248,110. There has been apparently a remarkable improvement in revenue of Rx. 2,823,096 on the original estimate. But an examination of the figures shows that they are not so satisfactory. Rx. 1,569,000 is due to an improvement in opium. The other item which has contributed to the increase of revenue was Rx. 941,000 in customs, mainly due to the taxation which had been imposed at the beginning of the year. The increased expenditure was Rx. 1,828,000, but the whole of this is more than accounted for by the loss on exchange — namely, Rx. 2,121,468. If in this increased expenditure is included the additional sum added for the Famine Insurance Fund we find that the Government of India have accomplished the remarkable feat of keeping within their original estimate by Rx. 848,000. It is often said in certain quarters that an improved system of control by Parliament over Indian finance could be introduced. I hold the contrary view, believing that the financial control exercised over expenditure in India is more efficacious than any control that could be exercised in this country would be. I do not remember any occasion here where the Treasury have been able to save £800,000 in their original estimates. The rupee for this year was taken in the estimate at 14d. and it realized 13·1d., and this involved a charge of 200 lakhs in addition to the sum originally provided. The total charge amounted to Rx. 14,615,300 or 26 per cent. of the total net expenditure of the Indian Government. The next year 1895-96 is a very remarkable financial year, and I hope marks the commencement of a new financial era. The Indian Government budgeted originally for a surplus of Rx. 46,200 but they only obtained this surplus by much scraping and paring. They cut down the grants originally made for the local Governments by Rx. 405,000, and they only placed Rx. 470,000 to the credit of the Famine Insurance Fund. Since that estimate was made much has happened. There has been the successful expedition to Chitral, which entailed an unexpected charge of 160 lakhs upon the revenues of India. Then the Government have increased their Famine Insurance Fund by 53 lakhs of rupees; they have revised the Indian cotton duties, which entailed a loss of about 26 lakhs of rupees, and they have repaid to provincial Governments 40 lakhs of rupees. They therefore have had to meet an additional expenditure of Rx. 2,840,000, and yet, I am glad to say, the revised estimates showed a surplus of Rx. 905,200, and the gross accounts show an even better surplus—namely, Rx. 1,604,000. Let us examine this remarkable improvement in the financial condition of the Indian Government, because it is desirable to see how far that improvement is due to permanent and reliable causes, and how far it is due to incidents which are ephemeral and accidental. The revenue shows an increase of Rx. 1,405,300, but again opium absorbs a great amount of that increase—namely,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Rx. 873,000. The remaining Rx. 532,000 is due to a general advance under most heads of revenue. Against that must be put the amount of the cotton duties, by the remission of which the Government will lose in an ordinary year Rx. 495,000. When we examine these figures we see that there is a very small margin of revenue upon which the Government can rely to provide for any fiscal reform or increased expenditure. I am glad to say that again the Indian Government have shown signs of a remarkable frugality and control. The total increase of expenditure at the close of the year, including all these large sums which I have mentioned, is only Rx. 500,000, or 50 lakhs, as against charges incurred of 284 lakhs, showing an improvement of 234 lakhs. This is due to two causes. The exchange, estimated at 13·09, realised 13·68, so that there was an improvement of Rx. 1,610,000, and this saving in exchange almost exactly balanced the cost of the Chitral expedition. There was also a saving of Rx. 742,300 on the ordinary expenditure of the Army, and there was a further saving in other branches of expenditure, amounting to Rx. 234,900. These two figures taken together account largely for the remarkable improvement in the financial position, to which I have called attention. Thus we see in one year a loss in exchange very largely diminished by a saving in expenditure, and in the next year we see a gain in exchange greatly enhanced by further savings so as to cover very large unexpected disbursements. Here I must interpose a few observations upon the subject of the cotton duties. When those duties were imposed my predecessor in office imposed them on a certain condition—namely, that the duties were in no sense to be protective, and he undertook, should there be any vestige of protection about them, to take steps for their removal. When I succeeded the right hon. gentleman I had to look into the matter, and it appeared to me that there was an infringement of the condition. It became clear that we must either tax all imported cotton on yarn value or tax all cloth in India on its full value. We arrived at the conclusion that it would be most inadvisable to draw a hard and fast line in respect of various qualities of goods and yarns and to say, on the one side there shall be a duty and on the other side there shall be no duty. The House can hardly realise the extraordinary ingenuity which manufacturers show in keeping within a line of exemption. A deputation on this subject produced certain figures which are so extraordinary that I should like to call attention to them. The passage to which I refer is found on page 199 of the Blue-book on the cotton duties: "In the six months of 1878, when the first change was made admitting some classes of goods duty free, our exports to India were 9,000,000 yards of duty-free goods and 358,000,000 yards of goods paying duty. The following year, although the larger measure was only introduced in March, in the six months following March the duty-free goods were 99,000,000 yards and the duty-payable goods 323,000,000 yards, and in the corresponding six months of 1880 the duty-free goods were 360,000,000 yards; those on which the duty was paid were 164,000,000 yards, and the revenue from cotton duties, which was £200,000 in 1878, was reduced to £81,000." The arrangements that I have made have been attacked somewhat unfairly in certain quarters. My desire was to put the industries dealt with on a footing of perfect equality, and I claim that we have succeeded in doing that. Now I come to the Budget for 1896-97; but before I deal with the figures I should mention that there are two decisions which have been arrived at by the Indian Government which have absorbed a considerable sum in addition to the ordinary expenditure, as compared with the expenditure of the preceding year. The Famine Insurance Fund we determined to raise to Rx. 1,000,000, and that entailed on the revenue of this year an extra charge of Rx. 473,000 over and above the Budget estimate of the preceding year. But we further came to an important decision with reference to the Army. Those who have read the papers on the Indian financial statement in the Legislative Chamber of Calcutta will find there a most interesting and valuable speech by General Sir Henry Brackenbury as to the efficiency of the Indian Army; and especial importance, I think, attaches to that statement as he is probably of all living authorities the best acquainted with the conditions of foreign service. He has made that a special object of study, and was for many years the efficient and capable head of the Intelligence Department of the War Office. (Hear, hear.) He gives in the highest terms his opinion of the efficiency of the native Army—(cheers)—and gives a number of details showing the extraordinary improvement that has been made in recent years in organisation and powers of mobilisation. He also calls attention to the great economy in administration. But Sir Henry Brackenbury's speech reveals, at the same time, certain defects as regards power of mobilisation, and for some time past the Indian Government have pressed on us the desirability of allowing them to add largely to the reserve, and especially in connexion with camels. Camels are very delicate animals and require special handling, and it has been found that when a large number of camels are bought a very large proportion of them die in consequence of those attending them not being acquainted with their habits. Therefore we have provided for a reserve depôt of camels. We have also allowed for a reserve of 1,000 horses to be established in addition to those already in reserve. This will greatly increase the mobilising power of the Indian Government; but I will say at once that the India Council would not have agreed to this if it had not been of opinion that the native Army was fit to go anywhere and to meet any troops in the world. (Cheers.) In respect of these two matters, then, we start with a debit of Rx. 968,700. Exchange is taken at 13·75d., as against 13·1d. for the preceding year, and that gives a reduction in the charge on that account of Rx. 1,065,000. There are various other improvements and fallings off in the revenue, but after taking them into consideration we get a total improvement of Rx. 1,770,200. On the other hand, there is an increase in expenditure amounting to Rx. 338,000, which is almost entirely due to the very low estimate taken on account of the railway revenue. For some reason or other for the last few months the returns of the railroads have not been as satisfactory as we could wish, and in the circumstances we thought we were justified in taking a very low estimate. Deducting Rx. 338,000 increased expenditure from the improvement in revenue of Rx. 1,770,200, that leaves an improvement of Rx. 1,431,800, and if the special expenditure to which I have referred, of Rx. 968,700 is deducted from that amount, we get an estimated surplus of Rx. 463,100 for the present year. (Hear, hear.) I think I can congratulate the House on the fact that for the first time since 1891 the Secretary of State for India is able to show a surplus for each year, and that which makes those surpluses more satisfactory is the fact that they are honest surpluses, and the total expenditure in this country for the last two years has been defrayed without a loan. Whenever loans are raised in this country they affect exchange in two ways—namely, by diminishing the amount of rupees, and by their being sold at a higher rate. From 1888-89 to 1893-94 inclusive loans have been raised in this country in order to meet the liabilities of the Secretary of State in this country, but I am glad to say that in the three years to which I am alluding we have been meeting the whole of our obligations without having recourse to a loan. (Hear, hear.) It is also satisfactory to note how the improvement has progressed. Taking the last four years, we started in 1893-94 with a deficit of Rx. 1,546,999. In 1894-95 we had a surplus of Rx. 905,000, in 1895-96 a surplus of Rx. 1,600,000, and this year we have a surplus of Rx. 463,000. This improvement in Indian finance has greatly improved the borrowing power of the Indian Government, and the credit of the Indian Government to-day stands in an unparalleled position. Taking the credit of India in England, in 1889 the Government congratulated themselves on being able to raise a 4 per cent. loan at just below par. In 1893 they were able to raise a 3½ per cent. loan which realized 96·21, and this year we made the experiment of raising a 3 per cent. loan in England, and it was covered six times over and taken up at 110. Now, Sir, if the statement I have made had been made by a Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to this country it would have seemed of so satisfactory a character that the general verdict would have been that it was a forecast that a remission of taxation was almost certain to take place in subsequent years. If India were similarly situated to this country such might be the case; but, unfortunately, it is not. Therefore I must warn the House against drawing any false inferences from what I have said. India differs from this country in two essential particulars. It is not self-contained as to expenditure; and, secondly, the Indian Government, unlike the British Government, is not in possession of any reserve of taxation either direct or indirect. The obligations in gold which year by year have to be met mainly arise in connexion with home charges, and there is no possibility of their being diminished. But that is by no means the greatest difficulty with which we now have to deal. Without almost any warning the charges in connexion with exchange which

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

we have to meet are subject to sudden fluctuations, and therefore the abruptness of the fall and the magnitude of the charge so imposed constitute a double financial difficulty with which India has now to contend. The fall in the value of the rupee of one-tenth of a penny causes a loss of 22 lakhs; or, in other words, a fall in exchange of a penny means a loss in the revenue of the year of 220 lakhs of rupees. The experiment of closing the mints for the purpose of improving exchange was an artificial makeshift; but at the same time, it has succeeded in doing that which its promoters anticipated—namely, it has caused a divergence between the exchange value of the rupee and the price of silver; but, although it has done that, still the market price of silver is the dominant factor in the exchange value of the rupee. Influences so widespread, cross currents so mixed, production so curiously controlled, political, commercial, and monetary interests so intermingled affect Indian finances to such a degree that it is impossible to foretell what is going to happen from the premonitory symptoms. Taking the surplus of exports over imports and the relative exchange values, it will be found from the explanatory memorandum that in 1893-94, when the exports were 4,057,000 tens of rupees under the imports, the exchange value was 14·547d.; the next year, when there was a considerable suplus of exports over imports, it was 13·101d.; and in 1895-96, when there was only a slight balance in favour of exports, it was 13·680d. Therefore, in each year the exchange value of the rupee operated in exactly the reverse direction from that which might have been anticipated. What I wish to impress upon the House, therefore, is that, owing to the speculative and gambling character of the exchange value, the Indian Finance Minister finds it almost impossible for him to foretell how it will operate in any particular financial year, and the expenditure can only be met by a margin of revenue or by financial or taxable reserves capable of immediate realisation. In these circumstances, we have to ask ourselves what taxable resources we have that are not now in operation. Of direct taxes there are absolutely none. The income tax is small and cannot be raised, and it is impossible to raise the succession duty. Besides that, these taxes are specially adapted to meet the difficulties and emergencies with which we have occasionally to contend. The only indirect taxation which is in our hands consists of the salt and Customs duties. The salt duty cannot be put higher because it is higher now than one could wish it to be. (Hear, hear.) Indirect taxes upon articles of great consumption cannot be varied from year to year, like the income tax, to meet the variety of charges; still less can they be abolished and then reimposed without causing general confusion in trade. Therefore, I may point out to the House that until the Indian Government can see its way more clearly in the future it cannot afford to part with any existing sources of revenue, although I am hopeful that revision and amendment of existing rates may not be outside our capabilities. (Hear, hear.) I lay these views before the House in the interests of sound finance and of those great producing trades and industries to whom uncertainty as to the future and a constant variation of taxation is most galling and injurious. There has been during recent years a development of two important portions of Indian policy, one external, the other wholly internal, but both bearing on Indian finance. In past years there has been an expenditure on frontier wars and upon punitive expeditions largely due to want of demarcation between ourselves and neighbouring responsible Powers. In view of the character of the frontier tribes and of the country it is of the greatest importance that the spheres of influence of the different Powers should be known, respected, and protected. There are on our Indian frontiers six such Powers—namely, Siam, France, China, Russia, Afghanistan, and Persia. The frontiers between India and some of these Powers have been demarcated. I trust that the demarcation of the Indian frontiers will lead to reduced expenditure and will inaugurate an era of more peaceful policy than has prevailed during recent years. With regard to Chitral, it was only the other day that we sent a number of troops up to that place, and during their march there was a heavy fall of rain, by which the bridges were broken and the road impeded; 4,000 men of the Khan of Dir were employed in repairing the bridges and the road, and the agreement entered into was loyally carried out. The camps were guarded by them, and, I am glad to say, the relations between our officers and troops and the tribes are steadily improving. What has occurred there may happen elsewhere. (Hear, hear.) I may say that the Chitral expedition has done an immense deal of good, because all along the route that our troops took the wild tribes that bordered it have been civilized to a large degree and the frontier has become settled. (Hear, hear.) The second movement to which I have alluded is that which relates to the construction of Indian railways. In this respect I have followed the policy that was laid down by the right hon. gentleman my predecessor in office. During the past year we have been able to make a substantial improvement in the means of railway communication by encouraging the construction of branch or feeder lines. We have also come to a definite conclusion to give a direct guarantee to those lines. The second matter which I looked into was the amount of capital annually given to main lines, and I thought that we might legitimately largely increase the amount devoted to that purpose. Hon. members who have the memorandum will see the amount devoted to irrigation and railways during the past three years. The sum amounts in 1894-95 to Rx. 6,637,944; in 1895-96 to Rx. 6,890,700; and in the present year to Rx. 11,550,600. (Cheers.) Including the expenditure by companies here, I think the outlay will exceed 12 crores in 1896-97, and this high rate will be practically maintained for three years. It will also interest the right hon. gentleman to know that we have arrived at a new decision as regards the means for supplying these funds. Of course it was desirable to keep down our obligations as much as possible and to have recourse to the loan market in India first. We came to the conclusion that for the future the Indian Government should raise all money and advance it, and by that means to take care that the loan market in India is always exhausted before recourse is had to a foreign loan. Then the third change which is about to be made is that there should be an annual conference in India of the chief railways officers, presided over by the Viceroy, in order that they may thoroughly consider all the proposals that come up before them. It seems to me that in the past our policy has been too piecemeal. Proposals were constantly coming in with reference to a particular line, and it was absolutely impossible for the Indian Government or the India Office to express an opinion upon it until it had been considered in connexion with others, and also in connexion with the amount of money available. I believe that if the practice is once established of having this annual conference it will ensure that every line sanctioned shall be part and parcel of a carefully considered scheme and system. I think, moreover, that it will fit in with the views of the promoters of railways, because they will know that they have to send in their schemes by a certain time, and that if they are not in by that time they will probably not be accepted. The return on railroads is satisfactory. In 1893-94 the percentage net receipts on lines in operation (independent of exchange) was 5·49; in 1894 it was 5·72, and in 1895 it was 5·82. The new mileage open in 1894-95 was 360, and in 1895-96 821. The new mileage sanctioned in 1894-95 was 651, and in 1895-96 it was 2,415. (Cheers.) Our experience as regards railroads in India is that the Indian Government have brought their Construction Department to such a point of ability that they can construct railroads more easily than private companies; on the other hand, private companies can, as a rule, more effectively work the lines. It is very desirable that railway enterprise should be largely developed in Burma, and we have recently entered into an arrangement with the Burmese Company by which they have undertaken to work the lines and provide the necessary capital for various feeders and extensions which from time to time will be necessary. I saw a statement in one of the newspapers that we had entered into an arrangement for the purpose of selling our interest in the lines; no such idea ever entered our heads. We have retained full control as to the rates and other conditions on which the lines may be worked. In looking at the question of railroads, I am glad to see that they have tended enormously to increase the amount of exports, during the last ten years, and have not only increased exports, but have also multiplied the staple commodities in India, so that India is no longer dependent on two or three staple productions. Looking to the other side of the balance-sheet to see how far British trade and industry have benefited by this increase, I think, on the whole, that it may be said that British goods have obtained their full share, with one notable exception, which is, I think, worthy of the attention of the House. There are two forms in which steel and iron are imported into India—in the shape of rails or railway material, and in bars or bulk. This country practically monopolizes the imports of railway material, but I think this is rather due to the fact that

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the policy of the Government is to give some preference to home production. But when we come to steel and iron in bulk, there is a remarkable shrinkage in British imports into India. Twelve years ago we had 97 per cent. of the total imports of iron and steel into India, but according to the last return our percentage has shrunk to 56 per cent., while Belgium has risen during those years from 2½ per cent. to 39 per cent. These figures are those of iron and steel in bulk. Now I think there are some persons who maintain that foreign competition is a bogey, but here is clear and distinct evidence that in regard to a manufacture of which we had practically the monopoly we are gradually being ousted. I commend this to the attention of both masters and men, because if we get ousted from a favourable market such as India in a matter of this kind I think it is clear that in a short time we may also find that we may be similarly neglected for other countries as regards the import of railway material. I have to thank the House for the attention with which it has listened to the various topics on which I have dwelt. (Hear, hear.) No one, I think, ever commenced a statement in connexion with Indian finance without being impressed by the immense range of subjects with which he has to deal, and also by the multiplicity and complexity of the questions on which he is asked to give an off-hand opinion. I do not think that anybody who ever held the post I have the honour to occupy has not appreciated the assistance of outside advice, opinion, or even criticism; but whilst I welcome advice and do not repel criticism, I cannot help feeling that there is a tendency in certain quarters at the present moment to somewhat unduly disparage the benefits of British rule in India. Since I have been at the India Office I have made a point of reading the translations of native newspapers which are sent home, and I think there is no improvement in their tone; on the contrary, I think they now discuss many matters with much more acerbity, indulge in more general depreciation of the benefits of our rule, and are more apt to draw wholesale indictments against us. If that is the case I think a very grave responsibility rests with anybody who encourages that feeling by perhaps attaching undue importance to the infinitesimal drawbacks of the effects of our rule and ignoring its infinite benefits. (Cheers.) For this, and all Governments which exercise an administration over composite races, absolute perfection is not the standard; the standard is the comparative merit of the Government that is in existence with the Government which it superseded or the Government which might supersede it. If those who criticise our rule in India could only have a very short taste of the rule which it superseded they would for generations to come bless the Government. (Cheers.) I was reading the other day accounts of the improvements which have taken place by the acquisition of the territories in Upper Burma, and the change that has taken place there is extraordinary. Ten years ago, outside Mandalay the government of the country was one of wholesale misrule. The hill tribes desolated the plains, thousands of cultivators annually migrated, dacoity in many parts was supreme, and outside the capital there was not a mile of road or a decent public building. There were no orderly law courts, and corruption and blackmail were the only methods of administration known. Now what is the position? An efficient police has been established; law courts subject to regular laws have been opened; violent crime has decreased from 3,408 in 1888 to 232 in 1894. The garrison has been reduced by more than a half, the hill tribes are pacified and quiet, emigrants are flocking back, cultivation is everywhere increasing; and notwithstanding the abolition of internal customs, the revenue has risen from 65 lakhs to 114 lakhs. (Hear, hear.) Such are some of the advantages which British rule has conferred on the native populations which have come under its power. I quite admit that there are many questions in regard to which I can only lend a ready ear to the suggestions or advice of persons who have experience or are competent to give it. Between European races and the vast population of India there are racial, religious, and social differences, and it is enormously difficult to graft European ideas of progress and reform upon primitive customs or upon old Eastern traditions, and all these difficulties result in a labyrinth of complex and contradictory problems such as, I suppose, no other Government in the world has to deal with. I think no one can pretend that through all these questions he can see light, even if he can frame principles for his guidance or exactly describe his goal. On all these questions there must be wide differences of opinion, but still there are certain principles on which we can all agree. A sense of external security, of inward quiet, of internal improvement, high credit, a flourishing exchequer, and a capable and impartial administration—these are elements by which, I believe, despite difficulties of race, religion, and custom, the prosperity and consolidation of this vast population can be effected and their loyalty and goodwill obtained. I venture on behalf of these three years to claim that they have done their fair share towards the realisation of these results. (Cheers.)

SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S AMENDMENT.

PARLIAMENT AND INDIAN FINANCE.

THE MORE EFFECTUAL DISCHARGE OF AN EXISTING DUTY.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN said that he was hopeless of any benefit arising from the Indian Budget Debate under the present system, or rather want of system. (Hear, hear.) Intricate accounts involving an expenditure of nearly Rx. 100,000,000 were placed upon the Table, and the House had no guidance in deciding whether the explanations of the Secretary of State were satisfactory or otherwise. The difficulty of the case was increased by the fact that the Secretary of State's "Explanatory Memorandum" had been only two days in the hands of members. Under such circumstances it was impossible that in the course of a few hours any profitable discussion could take place regarding Indian finance. He therefore asked the indulgence of the House in order that he might place before it a humble suggestion having for its object to obtain, in future years, a more systematic and effectual scrutiny of Indian Accounts. The amendment that stood in his name was as follows: "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the question, in order to add instead thereof the words—'With a view to the effectual discharge of its existing duty in respect of the finances of India, this House is of opinion that the East India Accounts should each year be examined and reported on by a Select Committee of the House, thus *mutatis mutandis* assimilating the practice as regards Indian Accounts, to that followed, by means of the Public Accounts Committee, in respect of the Accounts of the United Kingdom.'" It appeared to him that this was a simple proposal, and at the same time a moderate one. It proposed no new duty, and only indicated the way in which an existing and accepted duty might be properly performed. (Hear, hear.) It merely proposed that in dealing with Indian finances they should exercise the same reasonable care that they exercised with regard to their own. A trustee was required to give as careful attention to trust funds as to his own property. But in the present case there was a painful contrast between the promptitude and rigour with which the House looked after its own finances, and the indifference with which it treated those of India. For weeks all items of British expenditure were minutely debated, while the complete control of Parliament was secured by the action of the Public Accounts Committee. On the other hand one day at the fag-end of the Session was grudgingly given to Indian finance, and no steps were taken to make the parliamentary control anything but illusory. It was a bad object-lesson for India, who complained that they neither gave her a voice in her own affairs nor would attend to them themselves. The British system of control had gradually perfected itself since the passing of the Exchequer Audit Act, 1866, and in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee for the current year testimony was borne to the great benefits arising from the arrangements now in force. Referring to the excellent services of Sir C. Ryan, the retiring Comptroller and Accountant-General, the report reviewed the past history of the Committee and noticed the admirable results, as evidenced by the Public Accounts, of the arrangements introduced by the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act of 1866. The striking contrast, from the point of view of financial regularity, between the period antecedent and the period subsequent to that measure showed it to have been, in its peculiar field, an "epoch-making" statute. It appeared that in the first nine years after the passing of the Act the financial irregularities brought to light averaged twenty-five yearly; but during the nine years up to 1894-5 this number was reduced to two yearly, and during the last two years all irregularities had ceased. But the Committee pointed out that the improvement was greater than that shown by mere statistics. "An examination of the Auditors'

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

reports will," the Committee observed, "show, what the experience of your Committee confirms, viz., a remarkable diminution of controversy on first principles and the disappearance to a great degree of impatience of scrutiny, a sure and honourable testimony to the value of the work." If such solid benefits arose from the labours of a Select Committee of the House in dealing with British accounts, why should not the same benefits, *mutatis mutandis*, be extended to India? Of course the system of Indian finance differed from that of the United Kingdom, but he believed that if a Committee was appointed an arrangement could be devised adapted to the requirements of Indian methods. He felt confident that to accomplish this was not beyond the wit of the noble lord, the Secretary of State, who would thus remove the reproach of neglecting the golden rule. (Hear, hear.) It would be for the wisdom of Parliament to decide how best the Committee could do its work, so as to secure for the House a reasonable understanding of Indian finance, and a reasonable control over this most important department of Imperial affairs. For the moment the rise of exchange, over which we had no control, had saved the Indian Exchequer from its most serious difficulties. A fall in exchange, over which we equally had no control, would plunge the Indian Treasury into its former embarrassments, and he would remind the House that financial embarrassment in India meant increased taxation, and perhaps a demand on the Imperial Treasury. The control over British finance now so smoothly worked by the Public Accounts Committee had not been devised in a day, but had been gradually perfected by experience. He noticed that the system had first been applied to the navy so long ago as 1832, to the army in 1847, and it was not till 1866 that it was extended to all grants in Supply. Similarly, if the House should be pleased to appoint a Committee to deal with the Indian accounts, he had no doubt that such Committee, with characteristic British business capacity, would work out for itself a practical method of performing its duties towards the House. They would look to the noble lord who had long experience of Indian affairs in the House for guidance in this important matter. But he (Sir William) had given much thought to this subject, and he might perhaps be allowed to make a practical suggestion as to the direction in which such a Committee might most advantageously work. He would suggest that the principal materials for the labours of the Committee might be provided by a special report on the financial condition of India, supplied each year by the Government of India, such report being based on the debates on the Indian Budget in the Viceroy's Council. The House was aware that the Council contained a certain proportion of non-official members nominated by the Viceroy, and under Lord Cross's Act of 1892 certain public bodies were allowed to recommend a few members for nomination, thus giving voice to a certain extent to outside public opinion on Indian finance. The debates, therefore, in the Viceroy's Legislative Council would give the Committee valuable and definite matter for consideration, and if, under the Viceroy's rules of business, the non-official members were invited to move amendments and decide upon them, distinct issues would be provided for the Committee to examine and report upon to the House. The proposed annual report of the Government of India would, of course come through the India Office with the views of the Secretary of State in Council, and it would be received early in the Session, so that the Select Committee would have abundant leisure for its consideration, and it might be hoped that the influence of an important Committee of this kind would induce the Government of the day to bring on the debate on Indian finance at a reasonably early period of the Session. Such was a brief outline of his scheme, which he would gladly lay more in detail before the noble lord. In answer to his question in the House a few days ago the noble lord expressed an opinion unfavourable to the appointment of a Select Committee on Indian finance. But he thought this unfavourable opinion was in great measure based on a misunderstanding of the proposal—a very natural misunderstanding, as in the limits of a question, the particulars of the proposal could not be set forth. The two main objections raised by the noble lord were that the proposed enquiry would seriously interfere with administrative work in India, and would entail large expense. No doubt these objections were based on the supposition that it was proposed rigidly to follow the procedure of the Public Accounts Committee, and make the duty mainly one of appropriation audit. As he had already explained, that was not the intention of the present proposal. No doubt there was in India an appropriation audit, but it was one entirely different in character and effect from that in England. In England the appropriation audit was of the highest possible importance, being the machinery by which Parliament exercised its financial control over the Executive, and especially the Treasury. In India, the appropriation audit was merely an arrangement by which the Executive controlled its subordinate departments; it was of little use, and of no constitutional importance whatever. As it was not proposed that the Committee should carry out an appropriation audit for India, the difficulty suggested by the noble lord disappeared, because departmental officers would not be called from their administrative duties in India, and no expense would be incurred. He would no longer detain the House. It was for the House to decide how a difficult, but manifest and admitted, duty towards India could best be performed. No one considered that the present state of things was creditable. It might not be possible to do complete justice to India in this matter. But that was not a reason for doing nothing. They might make an effort and do their best. No one could do more than that. (Cheers).

MR. H. J. WILSON.

Mr. H. J. WILSON, in seconding the Amendment, remarked that the noble lord the Secretary of State himself could hardly regard the circumstances in which the Indian Budget debate took place in this House as satisfactory. The noble lord's speech was listened to during a considerable portion of it by twelve members on the Government side and nine on the Opposition. How could it be expected that those voluminous details could be mastered and digested in the time at their disposal? Whether the propositions of his hon. friend were practicable or not, he did not feel himself competent to express an opinion. He only desired to urge that something or other should be done.

MR. B. L. COHEN.

Mr. B. L. COHEN said that the first thing which struck him in considering this motion was the extraordinary want of connexion between the suggested remedy and the alleged grievance. It was true that the memorandum of the Secretary of State had only been in the hands of hon. members for two or three days, but he had read that statement with very little interest. Nearly all its contents were familiar to him from the document which had been in the hands of hon. members for two or three months—namely, the financial statement of the Indian Government. This statement had been in their hands since June 24th. It seemed to him that the hon. member was proposing to substitute a faulty, certainly an imperfect, system of audit of accounts for a system which was the most ideally perfect, and for as clear and business-like a statement which any private or public body had ever examined. (Hear, hear.) He did not believe that the acceptance of any such arrangement as had been suggested would favour the better examination of the finances of India. He thought that the hon. baronet would acknowledge that the Public Accounts Committee had no control over the expenditure of this country, and the assimilation of the system to India could not in any way control or vary the expenditure by a rupee. He believed, therefore, that any deviation from the form in which the accounts of India were now presented would be to render more obscure that which was, in his judgment, quite clear. (Hear, hear.)

SIR H. FOWLER AGAIN.
REPLY TO SIR W. WEDDERBURN.

Sir HENRY FOWLER said he was surprised to hear the hon. baronet say that there was a mass of figures thrown on the Table of the House without anything to guide the House with reference to their meaning.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: I did not say that. I said there was no guidance to enable the House to decide whether the explanations of the Secretary of State on behalf of the Executive were satisfactory or otherwise.

Sir H. FOWLER said he did not understand the hon. baronet to say so. He thought, however, that the last speaker had given a true answer to that criticism—namely, that the House had a most clear, complete, and elaborate statement presented to it nearly three months ago, and that statement contained not only the most lucid and powerful explanation of the finances of

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India by Sir James Westland, one of the most distinguished Finance Ministers India had known, but the debate of the Indian Legislative Council, and the criticism by distinguished native members of the Council as well as Anglo-Indian members, on the various finance proposals of the Government. The hon. baronet said that the House had no control, as in dealing with the finances of this country in Committee of Supply, over the expenditure of India. No; nor was it a part of the Government of India that the House should control the expenditure of India in the same way as it controlled the expenditure in Great Britain. The House had by legislation delegated to two other bodies the administration of the finances of India, only reserving to itself supreme and final authority. The hon. member had urged the House to adopt the precedent of the Public Accounts Committee. But the hon. baronet could read the Standing Order under which the Public Accounts Committee acted: "That there shall be a Standing Committee, to be designated the Committee of Public Accounts, for the examination of accounts, showing the appropriation of sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure." The Public Accounts Committee had no more control over the expenditure of this country than they had over the expenditure of the London and North-Western Railway Company. The theory of our system was that every Parliamentary Vote must be placed by the Treasury under the control of a department responsible for the proper application of the money. The regular appropriation of the accounts must be prepared in the department; the accounts must be audited; but there was in no sense a Committee controlling the expenditure. Was this new Committee of the hon. baronet to be, so to say, the Auditor-General of Indian Accounts? There were more than a thousand accounting treasuries in India, and those accounts could not be audited here, nor could the House bring the officials home. The audit must take place in India, and nowhere else. The noble lord had told the House how complete and satisfactory was the control of expenditure in India, and that it was quite as effective as the control of the expenditure here. Complaint had been made that but few hon. members came to listen to the debate on the Indian Budget, but, short of enforcing penalties for non-attendance, hon. members could not be compelled to attend these debates unless they were so disposed. When, however, the question arose in the House affecting the administration, the policy, or the interests of India, the House was scarcely ever more crowded than on these occasions. It was not fair to represent to the people of India, therefore, that the present small attendance always characterised Indian debates, or that it was to serve as any gauge by which to measure the interest taken by the House of Commons in Indian affairs. (Cheers.) Was this Committee to be a mere Committee of audit, or was it to deal with questions of policy? Did the hon. baronet mean that the policy of the Government of India should be referred to this Committee? Apparently that was what he intended, because he spoke of this Committee as a court of appeal from the Legislative Council of India. To constitute such a Committee as that would not be in accordance with the constitution. But there was already a Committee which acted as a court of appeal from the Legislative Council of India, from the Viceroy's Council and from the Council in Whitehall, and that Committee was the Cabinet of the Queen representing the majority of the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.) The proposal that a Committee of the House of Commons should undertake the control of the whole expenditure of India and of the policy of the Indian Government, was a proposal which the House would not entertain, and which, if adopted, would be resented both in Great Britain and India. If to the responsibilities already resting upon the House they were to add responsibility for the details of Indian Government, the machinery of Parliament would inevitably break down under the weight imposed upon it. But in recent times the House had shown no unwillingness to listen to any well-founded complaint relating to Indian Administration, taxation, or finance. The House had discussed in the last two years as questions of Imperial importance, upon which the fate of a Ministry might hang, the subject of competitive examination for the Civil Service, the subject of the cotton duties, the opium question, and the retention of Chitral. On some of these subjects the House agreed with the Government of India, and on others it differed; but in each case the House recognised its Imperial duties, and discharged them in a manner which represented the convictions of the majority of the people of this country. It was his opinion that in constituting such a Committee as was proposed, and transferring to it the duties which belonged to the Secretary of State and the Government, they would be adopting a plan which would give no satisfaction in India and which would cause great trouble and expense. (Hear, hear.)

SIR C. DILKE.

Sir C. DILKE did not believe that there was any ground for making an attack upon the system of administering Indian finance. In fact, he thought the appointment of any Committee would only result in eliciting facts in favour of the Government of India in this regard. That, however, was not the last word that had to be said on the matter, because Governments were not based upon scientific principles only, but depended in large measure upon the consent of the people to be governed. They must always take into consideration the necessity of securing for their Government the popular support of the people. The opponents of this Motion failed to take into consideration that popular support might be obtained if some such scheme as the hon. baronet proposed were adopted. Lord Randolph Churchill, who was a very remarkable Secretary of State for India, and left a very great name, was always in favour of some system of Committee in that House with regard to the Government of India. The same could be said of the late Mr. Fawcett. As regards the principle of enquiry, whether regular, or whether only occasional, he did not think that the point was settled by the speeches that had been delivered. As he had said there was a great deal that could be said in support of the Motion of his hon. friend, but he would ask his hon. friend and his supporters what they meant by their Motion? Did they intend that questions of policy should be brought before this Committee? He did not himself think that it would be a fitting body before which to bring matters of policy. There was, however, a great deal to be said for the view of Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Fawcett in favour of occasional enquiry by that House into questions involving the policy of the Government of India. But there was a great deal to be said against an annual and lasting enquiry by a Committee of that House, that would involve the policy of the Government of India. That would be a disturbing cause and would do harm and unsettle the finances of the Indian Government, and undermine the authority of the Legislative Council in Calcutta. Let them consider for a moment the weakest point of our rule, viz., that they had to rely in dealing with the people upon Native police, and that those police were not as satisfactory officers as they might be. Was the Committee which the hon. baronet proposed to consider, under the cloak of finance, the re-organisation of the whole system of criminal administration in India and of police in India. Take another question. The Home Charges of India had been reduced by the manufacture of military stores in that country. India had saved money in that way, and the process might no doubt be carried further. Was a Committee of this kind to consider that question continuously year by year? He thought it would be impossible for it to do so, for they would fail to get men of the qualifications necessary to carry such enquiries on year after year. In fact, this would virtually amount to assuming a portion of the responsibility of the actual government of India. Therefore he did not think that his hon. friend would suggest that questions of policy of that kind ought to be submitted to a Committee of the House, although he agreed that from time to time, examination by that House of questions affecting India was desirable. Then came the question whether, with these limitations it would be wise to have a Finance Accounts Committee, a Public Accounts Committee, on the finances of India. Arguing as he did, absolutely with the view that the financial system of India was a good one, he did believe it would be a good thing that the enquiry which they pretended to make in the House with a very thin attendance at the end of the Session, should be made by an annually appointed committee of the House; but he would give that committee no power over the Government of India. He believed that would be a better and more popular form of dealing with the accounts of the Government of India than the control they pretended to exercise in the House on the last day but one of the Session.

SIR H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK-ALLAN rose to call attention to the remarks made by a very high English military authority with regard to the troops of India.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

The SPEAKER: I think the hon. member must reserve his remarks on that subject until the main question is put again.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said he was bound to say that he agreed with everything the right hon. gentleman had said. He had had a good deal of experience of these committees, and he found that in proportion as the numbers of a Committee were increased the quorum had to be diminished. He asserted that it was no use whatever to appoint a Select Committee to enquire generally into Indian finance. The finances of India constituted a very large question, and he was convinced it would be almost impossible to bring the members of a Committee of this kind together in sufficient numbers and sufficiently often to enable them to report with effect on a question of such importance. He could not help thinking that what the hon. baronet wished was to appoint a Committee, nominally to investigate accounts, but in reality to interfere with policy. A more mischievous proposal he could not conceive. We had an Indian Government, they could control their policy in the House of Commons, and if the House of Commons disapproved of their policy they could express their opinion upon it; but to try and make that policy futile by checking expenditure which was necessary to give it effect was a mad suggestion. The hon. baronet also seemed to think that the more the House interfered with Indian finance the more economy would be promoted; but that was certainly not his view. Then the hon. baronet, the member for the Forest of Dean, spoke on one or two questions on which enquiry might be judicious—questions connected with native manufacture.

Sir C. DILKE: I said I could not support any proposal for an annual or permanent Committee to consider any question of policy.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said he could understand the propriety, and even the necessity, of appointing a Select Committee to enquire into some definite subject; but, surely, of all the instruments for that purpose, the most inconvenient would be a Committee of Accounts. In the circumstances, he hoped the hon. baronet the member for Banffshire would not press his Motion.

MR. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE.

Mr. M. M. BHOWNAGGREE thought it was not the intention of the hon. baronet, so far as he understood it, to have any sort of controlling Committee whatever. A sort of feeling did prevail, no doubt, both in this country and in India, that the statement of the accounts of India, which was submitted to the House at the end of every Session was not listened to by a sufficient number of members to satisfy the people of India that an interest was really taken by the House in their affairs. Whether that feeling was right or wrong he was not prepared to say, but, after listening to the elaborate and eloquent speech of the right hon. gentleman the late Secretary of State for India, he believed that the notion founded on that supposition would be to a certain extent dispelled. The purpose for which he rose was simply to ask the hon. baronet opposite not to press his Motion to a division. He believed it would do more harm than good. If hon. members were convinced that the accounts of India should be submitted to and attended to by a a Committee of the House, they ought to have time to deliberate on the way in which that was to be secured; but to bring forward a Motion of this importance, and to ask the House to decide upon it, would only lead to one result, and that was that the House would never listen to any argument in favour of submitting the Indian accounts to the House at a time when there was a fuller attendance.

The House divided on Sir W. Wedderburn's Amendment, when the figures were:—

For the Amendment	30
Against	110
Majority against	80

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS said that he understood that he would not be in order in bringing forward the Motion of which he had given notice, namely, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to revise the arrangements under which political control is exercised over Indian Princes and Chiefs, and especially to provide that in future no deprivation or penalty shall be imposed upon an Indian Prince or Chief on the ground of maladministration or misconduct until the fact of such maladministration or misconduct shall have been established before a public and independent tribunal." It was, he thought, most important that in the interest of the continuance of satisfactory relations between the Indian Government and the Indian people, that it should be made plain that the Indian Princes and Chiefs would not be interfered with, would not be punished or deprived of their ruling powers without an adequate and fair trial. He would not encroach one hair's breadth upon the essential condition of British rule in India, namely the right and obligation of the Indian Government to depose or punish those Princes or Chiefs when charges of misconduct or misgovernment were proved, but he contended that before action was taken by the Government in that direction, the men should have an opportunity of stating their case before an impartial tribunal. The foundation of the policy he advocated was to be found in the Proclamation of '58, for in that Proclamation the Queen said to the Princes of India, "We will respect the rights, dignity, and honour of the Native Princes as our own." From that day to this the Native rulers had shown their appreciation of the confidence reposed in them, and they had shown loyalty to us by helping us with money and troops in time of our need. There were precedents which proved that the Indian Government had taken the course he desired. For instance, when charges of misgovernment were brought against the Gaekwar of Baroda in 1875, a Commission, consisting of three English Judges and three Natives, were appointed to enquire into them. The same pledge which was given in the Proclamation of '58 was given at the historical assembly at Delhi, but in his belief, and in the opinion of a number of those who acted with him, the Government of India had recently violated the spirit of the pledges they had given, and the effect had been to create an impression in the minds of the Native rulers that the policy of the past was not going to be rigidly enforced in future. It might be said that an enquiry was conducted in the case of the Maharaja of Jhalawar, but he could not admit that when charges of misconduct or mismanagement against a Native ruler were enquired into by a political agent, the enquiry could be called an impartial one. Until it was made quite plain that we intended to treat the Native rulers with respect, and intended to carry out our pledges, a very unfavourable impression would exist in their minds, and until that impression was removed there would exist a feeling of dissatisfaction and disquietude which might have serious consequences.

SIR ANDREW SCOBLE.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE said that the hon. gentleman opposite was no doubt perfectly right in saying that a well-governed neighbouring Native State was a source of strength to the Indian Government as well as of happiness to the population of the State itself. The Government of India fully recognised that fact, and they did their best to ensure the good government of all the neighbouring Native States. The Government of India, however, interfered with the domestic government of native States with the greatest reluctance, and only in such cases where such interference became absolutely necessary. He could not conceive what tribunal the hon. member proposed to set up in place of the Government of India, who had always acted most impartially in all cases in which their interference had been necessary. To set up a fresh tribunal of any kind would increase rather than diminish the responsibilities and difficulties of the Indian Government. No doubt proposals of this kind had rather a specious air at first to those who were not intimately acquainted with India, but when they came to be examined into, that speciousness disappeared, and it was soon discovered that it was impossible for them to be carried out practically. (Hear, hear.)

MR. BHOWNAGGREE.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE, who had given notice of the following motion: "That the system of combining executive (revenue and police) with judicial duties in the same officer which at present prevails in India is objectionable in principle, inconvenient in practice, and calculated to shake the confidence of the people in the administration of justice; and that, therefore,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to revise the system, with the view of effecting a separation of judicial from executive functions," said that he had given notice of a motion upon the subject of the system of combining executive with judicial duties in the same officer, which the forms of the House would not permit him to move, and therefore he would only deal with the matter in a general way. In the first place, however, he hoped he should be permitted to congratulate the noble lord upon the very interesting and lucid statement he had delivered that evening, in the course of which he had been able to show that the finances of India were in a better state than they had been in for many years. (Hear, hear.) He must also congratulate the noble lord upon the improved credit which India now enjoyed, both in this metropolis and in India itself. It was also a matter for satisfaction that the demarcation of the Indian frontiers had been proceeded with to so great an extent. He was glad to hear from the noble lord that inducements had been held out to Indian capitalists to invest in Indian railways, because he believed that it would not only be an encouragement to Indian investors, but would tend to develop the railway communication of the country by construction of new lines. He now came to the subject of his notice of motion. He might say, in the first place, that all native administrators of the highest capacity admitted that law and justice in India had never been so well administered as it had been under British rule. To say that law and justice were administered in India very much in the same manner as obtained in this country was equivalent to saying that that administration had obtained a very high level indeed. (Hear, hear.) Every human system, however, had its defects, and there were certain defects in the administration of law and justice in India. That was the fault, not of individuals, but of the system which had been handed down from generation to generation—in fact, ever since the establishment of British rule in India. In the past it was found expedient to allow things to go on as they were, but now, in more settled times, and with a higher standard before us, he had thought it to be his duty to draw the attention of the noble lord to the defects in the administration to which he had referred in the hope that the noble lord would promise to give due consideration to the subject, and to do his best to remedy those defects. There was a system in India which was not known here, namely, that in the large districts the judicial, revenue and police functions were mixed up. He read the statement of an officer who stated that in the extensive and thickly-populated districts he had for years combined in himself the functions of head of the police, head magistrate, head superintendent of prisons, head revenue officer, head tax collector, head of the Treasury Department, head manager of Government estates, head engineer, head sanitary officer, and other functions. This was the statement of an officer occupying a distinguished position under the Government of India, and he could assure the House that it was true. When the same person held so many offices the judicial function must be affected, for even the highest men in the service of the Government were human beings. In the districts there were three grades of magistrates, known as first, second, and third class of magistrates; these were under the chief executive officer of the district, who was called the district magistrate or collector. The first class of magistrates had power to inflict two years' rigorous imprisonment, and the second and third class had power in a less degree. Under this district officer there were officers who were also invested with executive and judicial functions, down to the lowest grade, and known as the joint, assistant, and deputy-magistrates. Then there were the deputy-collectors, and even the sub-deputy-collectors. The executive functions were of a very varied character, and naturally brought them into relationship, and even into conflict, with the inhabitants of the district, and yet in the same district these officers had to perform their duties as judges in certain matters. The consequence was that very often preconceived notions in regard to their judicial functions were attributed to them; but, whether this was a fact or not, they could not deny that in some cases, if not in many, such a misconception was possible, and if it occurred it might taint the purity of justice. This had been a vexed question for a century past. In 1793 it engrossed the attention of Lord Cornwallis, who made a regulation that the collectors of revenue who presided over Revenue Boards should be divested of the power of deciding upon what were practically their own Acts. In 1860 there was a Commission, which reported on the organisation of the police, and declared that the judicial and police functions were not to be confounded. Sir Bartle Frere, in introducing the Act of 1860, expressed the hope that at no distant period the principle for which he was contending would be acted upon throughout India. That principle had been acted upon in some portions of our Indian dominions, but at the same time there were still considerable portions where the collector or the district judge was also the head of the judicial system. This combination of functions had, he believed, very often led to a miscarriage of justice according to the opinion of the judges of the High Courts in India. At the present time, he believed, there was a quarrel on the subject between the High Court of Bengal and certain officers under the Government of Bengal. Many distinguished and weighty names might be adduced in support of this separation of functions which they desired, among them being those of Lord Hobhouse, Sir Henry Maine, Sir Richard Garth, Sir John Peter Grant, Sir J. Strachey, Sir Lepel Griffin, and two Secretaries of State belonging to both parties. Lord Kimberley had said that the difficulty was simply one of expense, and the objections which had been raised to this separation of functions had either been on the ground of expense or of prestige. He believed, however, that the change could be effected by a division of labour rather than by an increase of officers, so that extra expenditure would not necessarily be involved. It was possible to divide the various functions among the half-dozen assistants who were under the chief of each district, and to divide them in such a way that no assistant would have mixed duties. It was further objected to this reform that, unless the executive officer had judicial functions to perform, he would lose prestige. He himself was one who attached great value to prestige, especially in a country like India; but it should be prestige of the right sort, and not terrorism. The contention really was that every officer should have penal power to enforce his orders. That was not at all necessary, and such power was very likely to be abused. Any officer, European or native, who had the authority of the Government behind him, had quite sufficient prestige. A member of the Bar in Bengal had prepared a list of twenty cases where abuses of the kind he referred to had occurred. A reform which could be accomplished at such small cost and with so little difficulty ought to be at once put into effect. Of course the present system had been handed down from generation to generation; but he had said enough to show that there was at least a case for enquiry. The system must necessarily beget great distrust of the administration of justice; and, as far as the expense of reform was concerned, that consideration ought not to make the Government of India shrink from the necessary steps. The strongest basis of British rule in India—the reason why the people had such confidence in it—was above all the sense of justice with which that administration was inspired. That it was which had made the greatest impression on India, and if that confidence were shaken, the great fabric on which British dominion in India rested would also be shaken.

On the return of the Speaker after the usual interval,

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE said he trusted the Secretary for India would give his attention to the grievances in connection with the Indian Medical Service. Graduates in the Medical School in India had not had fair play, and it was believed this was based on racial considerations. Regard to these was inconsistent with the traditions of British rule in India, and the Secretary for India, he was sure, was the last person to attach any importance to racial distinction. The Queen, in her famous proclamation forty years ago, said that all her subjects would be treated equally without regard to distinction of caste, colour, or creed. In this connection he wished to call attention to the compensation allowances given to European officers on account of the difference in the exchange value of money and submit that these allowances under certain conditions ought to be extended to Native officers. Many of them had to go to considerable expense to send their children to this country to be educated to qualify them for the Civil Service, the legal profession, or the higher grades of the medical profession in India. Native officers, especially in the uncovenanted Service, should have the same privileges as their European brethren. He wished also to speak of the British-Indian subjects in South Africa, notably in the Transvaal, who were precluded by the local legislation in the Transvaal from acquiring and occupying tracts of land within certain limits. The Colonial Secretary had promised to look carefully into the question.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Then there was the exercise of the franchise by British Indians in Natal. The Natal Legislature in April last issued a proclamation excluding all subjects of her Majesty's Indian Empire from having the power to vote at elections. He did not see why the responsible authorities of the Natal Government should have imposed those restrictions unless they were based purely on considerations of race and colour. He admitted that there were distinctions of race that had to be preserved in every colony and community, but these restrictions were not meant to do any good or prevent any impending harm. The Secretary for India was the custodian of the rights and privileges of the Indian subjects of the Queen, and the Secretary of the Colonies had a controlling hand over the legislative proceedings of Colonies, and he hoped they would combine to bring about a remedy. It was a noble sentiment of the ex-Secretary for India, the right hon. member for Wolverhampton, that every member of the House was also "member for India." He implored the House, regardless of Party considerations and petty racial feelings, to rise to that sentiment and as members for India see that the Indian subjects of the Queen were not deprived of their rightful privileges, and subjected to uncalled-for degradation and humiliation. The hon. member for Battersea said the objection to the employment of Lascars on P. and O. steamers was not based on racial prejudices. If the hon. member could come with him to India he would show him Lascars who in physique and skill were the equals of the hon. member himself. (Cheers and Laughter.) As far as loyalty was concerned, a more loyal and devoted people than the people of India, especially of the class of Lascars, there could not be found. Whatever distinction of treatment they made, let it be on the score of qualities and qualifications, but never on the score of caste, colour or creed. He fervently hoped that the Secretary for India, in conjunction with the Secretary for the Colonies, would take steps to remove the great indignity sought to be imposed upon British Indians in South Africa by the Natal Legislature refusing them the elementary right of every British citizen of voting for the candidates of such Legislature. He acknowledged the complimentary terms with which the Secretary for India had referred to the Indian army. He did not believe for a moment that the gallant General, to whom certain words had been attributed, attached to them the meaning applied to them afterwards. It was due that from his place there he should also disown the sentiment which was uttered within a very few months within the same room as that in which the gallant General's remarks were made. There was an exclamation used to the effect that the connection of Great Britain with India only tended to impose a great and material burden upon India, and that India also, at the same time contributed to the glory and greatness of England. He should be failing in his duty if he did not take the opportunity, in the name of the people of India, of saying that the connection of Great Britain with that country had been the instrument of conferring manifold blessings upon the people of India, and that if India had contributed in any sense to the greatness and glory of England, that was but a poor payment for the many blessings she had received.

SIR H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN.

Sir H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN, as one who had been associated with the native troops of the British power in India, entered his strongest protest against the construction that might possibly be put upon certain words which had fallen from the Commander-in-Chief of the British army. Nothing was further from the gallant gentleman's mind than to cast any reflection at all upon the spirit, the courage, or the loyalty of the native troops in India. No graver question could be raised than that of the efficiency of the Indian army. He had the honour of recollecting the British troops in India as far back as 1848, and on and off for nearly half-a-century, since that time he had been associated with them in various quarters and various fields, and he could safely say that, however great their efficiency and power might have been in former days, there was no period in the illustrious and chequered history of the Indian troops of the British Empire at which they were more efficient and better calculated to serve the purpose for which they were intended—namely the defence of their native country and British interests there—or were more disciplined, more loyal, or more zealous than at the present moment. As to the statement that had fallen from Lord Wolseley, he had since qualified it by stating that there was no more efficient, loyal or more splendid troops in the whole world than the native troops of the British Empire; but he had also said that the Indian army of 120,000 men, or thereabouts, was composed of races not all of equal martial quality. Those who admired them most would be the first to admit the truth of such a statement. He would undertake to say that, if the opinion of experts such as Sir Henry Brackenbury—whose report, dated the 28th March, on the Indian army had become a State paper deserving the study of every man in that House—Sir Donald Stewart, and Lord Roberts—who had been Commanders-in-Chief in India—had been given before a Commission like that on which Lord Wolseley gave evidence the other day, they would have been found to be the first to admit that there were great differences both in the martial qualities and preparedness for war of the various portions of their Indian troops. There were 50,000 of them as competent to be put in the field, if officered by a proper number of Europeans, as were any troops in the whole world. Lord Wolseley never intended to say that he was afraid or would decline to lead these 50,000 picked troops against any troops of any other military Power. This question of the efficiency of the British army in India, under the circumstances of the day, was of primary importance. He contended that the British army in India was equal to any contingency to which it might be exposed, and capable of facing any opposing force, if only it had a proper number of European officers. That was the great defect in the present system. After the Mutiny it was thought right to reconstitute the Indian Army. In the belief that a few regiments that were called irregular had done well with three British officers, the great mistake was made of reconstituting the whole of the Native Army with three British officers per regiment. Later on a fourth, a fifth, a sixth, a seventh, and an eighth officer were added, but the sooner we dissipated the idea that the whole of the Army in India was properly organised for operations beyond the Indian frontier the sooner we would arrive at a degree of safety which would prevent war. The Native troops were now organised on what he would call a fatal system—the system of three linked battalions. Was it credible to anyone who had studied the organisations of the great military Powers of Europe that there were only seven or eight British officers to each Indian native battalion, and that of the three battalions linked together, and there were forty or fifty of them, the theory was that one battalion was to be put into the field and that the twenty officers or so belonged to the three battalions? Everyone recollected the disaster that occurred to a portion of the Indian Army in 1879, when it was opposed to an Afghan enemy with a great preponderance of artillery. The defect of which he was speaking was then displayed in a striking way. Two Native regiments had only ten British officers between them, and in the course of the action five of those officers were killed or wounded, and the whole force crumbled up like a rotten stick. The brigade, under General Burroughs, was defeated, and had to retreat for nearly sixty miles simply because the Native portion was not officered as it ought to have been. He did not wish to say anything to the detriment of the Native troops on that occasion, because they fought gallantly side by side with their British comrades, but he did hope we would derive some instruction from that disaster. This was a question the magnitude of which could not be overrated. The taxpayers of Great Britain and the taxpayers of India—the most heavily taxed people in the world—had a right to know whether the money extracted from them for the support of the military power was rightly expended, so that when the occasion arose the soldiers they furnished would be so organised as to maintain the defences of the country in a proper way. He implored the Secretary of State for India to take advantage of the interest that had been excited by the somewhat misunderstood expression of Lord Wolseley to initiate a complete and searching enquiry as to whether the Native Army in India, as now officered by British officers, was efficient for its purpose or not. The time might not be far distant when it might be as important to this country that every portion of our Native Army should be as efficient for the purpose of the defence of the frontiers of India as the very pick of the troops of whom Lord Wolseley spoke. A great responsibility rested upon Lord Wolseley. Though Commander-in-Chief of the British Army, he was incidentally responsible for the Army of India, and therefore members of the House who were inclined to take a somewhat unfavourable view of the utterances of Lord Wolseley should make great allowance for a man in his position, and who

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

desired to do that which was for the benefit of his country. They might deplore that the utterances were made on an unfit occasion, and perhaps in an unfit way; but a great basis of serious truth underlaid what Lord Wolseley said. He therefore entreated the noble lord the Secretary of State for India to institute an enquiry at once as to whether the Native Army in India was, as to its proportion of British officers, in a secure position. A Commission, presided over by Lord Welby, had sat to enquire into the question of the apportionment of the military charges between India and England. He advised the Leader of the House to let no time elapse before reconstituting that Commission and enlarging its scope, so that it could go into the particular point he had now raised.

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE.

MR. PHILIP STANHOPE said that earlier in the evening he gave his support in a limited way to the motion of his hon. friend (Sir W. Wedderburn). Year after year they had pressed on successive Governments the necessity of providing occasions when Indian topics might receive adequate attention. The question to which he desired to draw the attention of the House was one of great importance to both England and India, and was of too large a character to enter into fully. He referred to the question of the cotton duties, and he wished to allude to it briefly for one purpose only. The noble lord had briefly referred to the duties in the lucid statement he had made touching the finances of India, and pointed out that the modifications he had been able to introduce into the scheme originally accepted by the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton had, at all events, produced this desirable result—that there was now an equitable system in existence as between the Indian and the English manufacturers. While he cordially acknowledged the good effect of those modifications, he would, on the other hand ask the noble Lord to remember that in former days he had expressed the opinion that those import duties, in whatever sense they might be regarded, were detrimental to trade, and that he had declared that they ought to be repealed whenever the finances of India would enable it to be done. (Hear, hear.) That declaration applied with as much force to the question to-day as it did when it was made, and therefore he hoped that the noble lord had not forgotten it. He was willing to admit that the present moment might not be the most opportune for raising the subject again, and that it might be well to give time for the recent changes in respect to the duties to settle. But he was anxious, nevertheless, that the subject should be kept in mind. (Hear, hear). A few months ago they were told that great agitation existed in India, and that the manufacturers and people of India were protesting against the changes introduced by the noble Lord; but, after all, very little had been heard of this great agitation. (Hear, hear). They were told that the Indian people were ready even to boycott Lancashire cloth and to adopt the most extreme measures of opposition, but no such thing had yet taken place, and he did not believe it was in prospect. He repeated that having regard to the fiscal changes just made in India, and to the fact that the silver question must be one of considerable anxiety to the people of India, remembering what was taking place in America, the present time might not be the best to raise the subject again. Therefore all he would ask the noble Lord to do was to bear in mind the fact that the question of the Indian cotton duties had not been absolutely settled, and that when a good opportunity occurred it would be re-opened. (Hear, hear). The rate of exchange at present, perhaps, was too precarious to enter upon the matter, but if next year the silver question was settled in America, and there was any prospect of the same stability in the course of exchange, he hoped and believed those hon. members who represented Lancashire would take an early opportunity of again raising the whole matter. It was not a party question —(hear, hear)—and it was one in which the interests of the people of India and those of British commerce were alike concerned. (Hear, hear.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought it was desirable that he should now make an appeal to the House to go into Committee. They had had a very interesting discussion, to which the hon. and gallant member for Durham and the hon. member for Bethnal Green had made very important contributions—(Cheers)—but that discussion had now run its natural course, and he trusted the House would at once go into Committee, when any financial point might be raised.

The motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair was then agreed to.

The House then went into Committee, and MR. J. W. LOWTHER, Chairman of Committees, read from the chair the usual statement as to revenue and expenditure.

SIR H. H. FOWLER.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LORD G. HAMILTON.

SIR HENRY FOWLER said he had to congratulate the noble lord on the satisfactory statement he had made to the House. He would not say that he entertained any feeling of envy towards him in respect to his position when he recollected how he had himself to be content with an increasing expenditure, a falling revenue, and a falling exchange, but at all events he could not help looking with some feeling of jealous pleasure at the statement the noble lord had been able to make—that although there was an increasing expenditure yet that there was an increasing revenue, and that a balance on the right side had been carefully maintained, and that the rate of exchange had improved from 1s. 1d. when he was in office to 1s. 2d. since the present financial year commenced. If that fortunate state of things continued it would certainly have a material effect on the finances of India. (Hear, hear.) He had always maintained, as the noble lord had done on that occasion, that the true secret of our financial difficulties in India was the difficulty of exchange, and that the great increase in net Indian expenditure was attributable, in the main, to the enormous loss sustained on exchange. The loss upon exchange during the last few years was given by the noble lord in his explanatory statement, which showed that while in 1882 the total charge for exchange was Rx. 10,000,000, in 1892 it was Rx. 7,000,000, and in 1896 it was Rx. 13,500,000. This was the real trouble they had to face, and he hoped that the expectations the noble lord had held out might be realised. He had been much gratified to hear that the frontier difficulties were coming to an end. Our anxiety had been owing not so much to aggressive action on the part of our neighbours in India as to the difficulty of ascertaining and settling what were the true frontier boundaries with neighbouring States, and he was glad that a similar policy to that pursued with regard to the settlement of the boundaries of the Pamirs was being pursued by the present Government in those important matters. It was true that the subject in which perhaps he took the greatest interest when he was in office was that of the extension of railways in India, and he was very pleased to note the advance which the noble lord had made in this work during the present year. Owing to the financial difficulties created by the loss on exchange the work of railway extension was suspended to a great extent in 1890, and in 1892 and 1893 it reached its lowest ebb. Therefore, it was very satisfactory to learn that the noble lord had been able to provide by various means upwards of Rx. 12,000,000 for expenditure on the work this year—(hear, hear)—for nothing could tend to promote prosperity in India more than a large railway expenditure. (Hear, hear.) In the last three years the percentage of net receipts on capital cost had increased from 5½ in 1893 to nearly 6 per cent in 1895; the number of passengers had increased in the same period from 135 millions to 152 millions, and the amount of merchandise conveyed on the Indian railways had increased from 28,000,000 to 32,000,000 tons. Therefore, this increased railway expenditure was a wise one because it was successful. He hoped the noble lord would continue to pursue this policy, and in doing so he would confer a great boon on the people of India. (Hear, hear.) A point on which the noble lord did not touch, and one to which he wished to refer, was the debt of India. The Indian debt was Rx. 122,000,000, and the sterling debt was Rx. 115,000,000. But that was not all the truth of the case, and he wished to call the attention of the Committee to page 23 of the Memorandum of the noble lord, in which, taking the figures down to March 31st, 1896, it was shown that, whereas the debt in India was Rx. 123,000,000, the assets against that debt in India were Rx. 148,000,000. Therefore, they had an actual excess of assets over liabilities of 25½ millions. But the debt of India was like the debt of a municipality in England, who incurred a debt to pay for a gas-works or to construct a water-works or any other reproductive works; and of all reproductive expenditure in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India, that on railways and irrigation was certainly the most satisfactory. (Hear, hear.) The rupee debt of India was really 123 million tens of rupees. Against that, in railways constructed by the State, which were producing nearly 6 per cent., in irrigation works, in loans to corporations, and in cash balances there was a set-off of 148 millions; showing that, so far as India was concerned, there was a balance to the good of 25½ millions. In England the increase of the debt was greater and the assets were less. The sterling debt of India in England was £116,000,000, and the charges, advances to railway companies, and cash on the other side of the account amounted to £68,000,000. Therefore, in England they had an uncovered debt in excess of assets of £47,000,000. If they deducted 25 millions from £47,000,000, the House would get at what was the real debt of India. He knew of no other country in the world where the real debt was of the smallness of the real debt of India. There was another point with reference to the taxation of India. He agreed with the noble lord that the sources of Indian taxation were limited. He did not see that there were many other sources from which he could draw, and that, of course, had a proper restraining effect on Indian taxation. He also agreed with the noble lord that there was one tax which he ventured to think had the first claim upon the Secretary of State and upon the India Council, and he was sure would have the first claim on the Legislative Council in Calcutta whenever there should be a surplus. That was the salt tax. (Hear, hear.) The salt tax was raised in a special emergency a few years ago. It was raised at a very high percentage, and, like the income tax in England, it was a tax which could be raised more readily than any other tax. In a time of, he would not say peace, but of tranquility and of prosperity, he was satisfied that it was to the interest of the Indian Exchequer, as well as to the interest of the taxpayer of India, that that tax should be at as low a figure as it reasonably could be. They were told that India was such a heavily-taxed nation. He did not deny the poverty of the Indian people, and he did not deny that the burden of taxation was heavy. At the same time, it was always well they should know what the exact figures were. The burden of taxation, according to the Secretary of State's own statement, was putting it into English money, 2s. 5¼d. per head in 1895; 2s. 6¾d. in 1896; and for 1897 he estimated it at 2s. 6½d. In this calculation he was taking the rupee as worth 2s. The taxation of England was on a very different scale. In England the taxation per head was £2 11s. 8d.; in Scotland, £2 8s. 1d.; and in Ireland, £1 12s. 5d. Those were, no doubt, very wealthy countries compared with India, but nevertheless there was a very great difference between 2s. 5¼d. and the figures he had just given. Again, the noble lord reminded them of what would happen if the British Government of India was superseded by another Government. He ventured to say there would be an enormous increase in the burden of taxation. (Cheers.) When he heard the economy of the British rule impugned and the expenditure of the British Government styled extravagant, he should like the House to contrast the British expenditure in Madras with the expenditure of the Government of Mysore, which was a native Government, one of the best native Governments, a Government of great ability, of great enterprise, and of great public spirit. He had the figures before him, but hon. gentlemen would perhaps take it from him as correct, that the expenditure, the taxation per head in Mysore was greater than it was in Madras. He simply made that remark, not as in any way casting the slightest reflection on the expenditure of Mysore, which he believed to be wise and just, but as some indication of the nature of the charges which were spread broadcast with reference to the expenditure of the Indian Government. He thought the Secretary of State would have to contemplate an increase in internal expenditure in India. As time went on, and as the wise demands of Indian civilisation increased, he was satisfied that in all those social, sanitary, educational, and other means of expenditure on which this country and their colonies prided themselves, and which were most happily increasing in India, he was satisfied the Secretary of State would have to increase his outlay. He hoped the House would pardon him if he said a word upon a matter in which he had a personal interest, and on which he had been criticised most severely, and on which his mouth had been closed—namely, the cotton duties, and if he also expressed his own opinion as to what was the best mode of carrying out that policy on which the noble lord and himself, he thought he might say, had been agreed. Nobody, he thought, would contradict the statement that from the very first he always maintained his determination to remove any just complaints that this country could have against these duties, so far as they were protective. The basis of his policy was that there should be no protection. It was admitted eventually, and he was himself convinced, that there was an element of protection in the duties. The Lancashire people contended that exempting local yarns of 20's was unfair to them, and that to tax the cloth at its finished value, whereas the excise duty was only upon yarns of 20's, and cloth of that weight was also unfair as favouring the local production. He thought the contentions were exaggerated, but as far as the principle was concerned they were made out. He thought the Government of India and the noble lord and his Council at home were quite right in recognising it. But the question arose: What was the best mode of removing that protection? And there, perhaps, he was rather disposed to part company with the noble lord. The ablest document he had seen in the Blue-book upon the question was the memorandum of Mr. Campbell, collector of land revenues and customs at Bombay to the Government of Bombay, and it was only fair and just to that distinguished officer to call the attention of the House to the great ability with which he dealt with the whole case, and although he himself was unable to concur in the conclusion at which Mr. Campbell arrived, he was not surprised that the noble lord and the Government of India had looked at that conclusion with favour and had practically accepted it. Now, Mr. Campbell pointed out that there were three courses open to the Government, and those three courses were—(1) to tax all cloth and yarns at finished values; (2) to tax all yarns over 20's and all goods containing such yarns and to exempt all cloth and yarns of 20's and under; and (3) to tax all woven goods and exempt all yarns. Now, the collector at Bombay stated that, in his opinion, the only practical alternative was to tax all cloth and exempt all yarns, and that was the view which the Secretary of State had taken. Before the matter came to the consideration of the Legislature in Calcutta the Bombay Government were consulted. That Government, representing as they did a portion of India containing the largest Indian manufacturing interests, were entitled to speak with some weight upon the question. The Bombay Government, in a letter addressed to them in January last to the Government of India, said there were two schemes put forward—namely, that of the Bombay millowners, which was to exempt all imported yarns of 20's and under, and all cloths made from such yarns, and to put them on the same footing as similar local produce, and that the excise should be imposed on the market value of all Indian cloth made from yarns over 20's. That no doubt removed all protection. The proposal of the collector of land revenue was that all yarns should be exempt, and that all cloth should be taxed at its market value. Mr. Campbell raised the point which had great weight, if he might say so, with the noble lord—namely, the difficulty of the dividing line at 20's. There was one other difficulty connected with this scheme which he should like to notice in passing, which was this, that if you levy a tax exclusively upon woven goods you leave out a very large class of native produce which was made in handlooms. Under the scheme which the late Government sanctioned the tax was levied on yarn, and, therefore, before ever it reached the handloom weaver it had paid the duty, but, of course, if yarns were exempt from duty that industry remained unchecked. What the Bombay Government said was this: "The fourth objection is, in the opinion of his Excellency in Council, of considerable importance. There are hereditary, skilled, and generally well-to-do weavers throughout the country who will be materially aided in their competition with the mills by a tax on the cloth produced in the mills from which they are exempt." That question was very fully discussed. It was discussed at Madras and Cawnpore, where this industry was, perhaps, more extensive than in any other part of India, and the Cotton Chamber at Cawnpore said, "This Chamber's views coincide with those expressed" (at Bombay). "Within the last five years two mills at Cawnpore have had to discontinue the weaving of cloth and stop their looms because of their inability to compete with hand-woven cloths." Two-thirds of the cotton cloth production in India was from hand-looms and one-third from powerlooms, and the impending legislation proposed to penalise the weaker industry. That view was repeated in a variety of other documents in the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Blue-book. He had no idea until he saw these figures that between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 persons in India were dependent on the handloom industry; and, of course, whether right or wrong, they must not overlook the fact that a large industry in India which must compete, he thought, with Lancashire and with the powerloom mills in India, was exempt from taxation altogether. There was another point raised by the Government of Bombay to which some importance should be attached. It was the serious objection to the taxation of cloths used by the poorer class of consumers. The difficulty of the dividing line was, of course, a question for experts, and he felt great hesitation in expressing an opinion upon it; but he could not shut his eyes to the fact that the illustration which the noble lord gave as to the marvellous conversion of duty-payable into duty-free cloths which took place in 1878 and 1880 had been dealt with very fully by the Bombay authorities. He thought that the objections with reference to the dividing line were not so strong as were objections to taxing the coarser cloths; and, balancing the two together, he said with hesitation, and with the knowledge communicated by the Governments of Bombay and Madras and the various chambers of commerce in India, that his own preference would have been to exempt from duty all yarns below 20's, and all cloths made from yarns below 20's, and to have levied a tax on everything above 20's. He thought that this would have removed all element of protection. He admitted that Sir James Westland did not agree with that view; but there was one point which they should not forget in this controversy and which he should like to commend to the attention of the House, to Lancashire, and Bombay as well. Sir James Westland said it would be seen that he had throughout dealt with this question on the assumption that the tax, whatever it was, fell on and was paid by the Indian consumer; much of the language held in Manchester would seem to indicate a belief that the tax fell on the producer. But Sir James could hardly believe that this view was seriously accepted by Manchester merchants, and he was quite sure that two years ago they would have rejected it as an economic heresy; this tax was paid, as all Customs and Excise taxes were paid, by the consumer sooner or later. It had been with great reluctance that he had been compelled by public considerations to take up the question, but they ought not to overrate and add to difficulties which did not really exist. His object was to make the burden on the Indian consumer as light as possible. If the Indian consumer bought Manchester cloth, he had to pay the excise duty. His policy was that the poor consumer who wore the coarser cloth, should not pay the duty. The yarns from which his clothing was spun were subject neither to customs nor excise. The decision at which the noble lord had arrived by alleging the impossibility of laying down a dividing line, had thrown this tax on all classes of the Indian people.

COLONEL MELLOR.

Colonel MELLOR felt bound to say a few words after the statement of the right hon. gentleman opposite. He thought he might speak with confidence on the matter from his long experience of the textile industry. He thanked the noble lord on behalf of all Lancashire, employers and employed, for the steps taken with regard to the import duties. The noble lord was undoubtedly placed in a very difficult position, and he faced it in a perfectly straightforward manner. He showed a grasp of technical points which certainly surprised a great many people in Lancashire, and he could not have come to a wiser, sounder, and juster decision. As to the difficulty of differentiating between coarse and fine cloths, he might state that in 1878, 1879, and 1880 his firm was largely engaged in manufactures for the Indian market, but a complete change took place in the nature of their products in consequence of the change of duties. The right hon. gentleman opposite might rely upon it that, if the plan he favoured was carried out, and there was again a differentiation, Lancashire would once more find means of evading the tax.

Mr. BHOWNAGGREE suggested that "substitute" would be a better word than "evade."

Colonel MELLOR said he would avail himself of the word "substitute." Reference had been made to the protection which the present arrangement afforded the hand-loom weavers of India. He, for one, thought that Lancashire weavers had nothing to fear from that protection. They did not believe that handloom productions could for long compete with powerloom productions. At one time there was an enormous production in Lancashire of hand-loom calico, but it had been displaced by power-loom calico. Hand-loom silk weaving had also almost entirely given way to power-loom weaving, and he believed the same process would come about with regard to the Indian products. But if it did not, who would be benefited? The poorest people on earth, to whom they did not begrudge the advantage. He believed these people made very little cloth for the bazaar, and he would be glad if they derived some little advantage from the change. He agreed that the first tax to be removed in India was the salt tax, but when the time did come they hoped and believed the noble lord would remove as early as possible these duties altogether—at a time when it would be advantageous to the finances of India and to the people and manufacturers of India and the manufacturers and operatives of Lancashire. The people of Lancashire had been accused of selfishness, but he was sure they did not wish to do anything to injure the people of India. After all, the 7,000,000 of hand-loom weavers of India were a small proportion of the 270,000,000 in India, and if they derived any comfort in their miserable lives from the change, by all means let them have it. He thanked the noble lord for what he had done in this matter.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN thought the noble lord was quite entitled to congratulation on the Budget he had been able to submit, but at the same time he thought that although the surplus that was shown was very satisfactory for the Treasury, there were certain figures in the account which showed that the condition of affairs was not so satisfactory for the Indian taxpayer. He would specially draw the noble lord's attention to the peculiar use of two words in these accounts—namely, improvement and deterioration. These two words were used solely from the point of view of the interests of the Treasury. They were used in a sense exactly contrary to the sense in which they would be used if applied to the financial position of India. Under the head of improvement was shown new taxation. New taxation did not improve the financial position of India. It showed a deterioration in the condition of the people. If he drew his savings out of the strong box and put them into current expenditure, that was not an improvement in his financial position. Similarly if a shop-keeper took money out of his strong box and put it into his till, that was deterioration, not improvement. Therefore, it was because these accounts looked only to the interests of the Treasury and not to those of the taxpayer, that he contended that in many respects they produced a false impression. He could not, therefore, accept the comparisons made in these statements, and he would instead give a comparison between two years including a space of 12 years, which would enable the House to see whether the condition of India was improving or not. When the year 1884-5 was compared with the year 1896-7, it would be found that the natural increase of revenue from the development of resources was about Rx.9,000,000, and the saving in the commercial service debt Rx.1,000,000, making a total improvement of Rx.10,000,000. With regard to deterioration, he found an increase in the land revenue from enhanced assessments of Rx.500,000, new taxation Rx.6,000,000 loss on opium revenue Rx.1,500,000, increase in civil services Rx.7,500,000, increase in military services Rx.8,500,000, reduction in Famine Grant Rx.1,000,000, making a total deterioration of Rx.25,000,000, or after deducting Rx.10,000,000 for improvements, a net deterioration in 12 years of Rx.15,000,000. The right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton had laid great stress upon the question of exchange, but as regarded the present rate of exchange, so far from its being a burden now, there was actually an increase of Rx.1,500,000, so that that bugbear of exchange would no longer be put forward and they might look much more to the constant increase in civil and military expenditure. He thanked the hon. gentleman, the member for the Radcliffe Division of Lancashire, for what he had said about the salt tax and the willingness of the people of Lancashire to see the needs of the great masses of the people of India relieved before the question of import duties was touched. He recognised that feeling gratefully, and he only trusted that by careful economy, not only the salt tax might be reduced, but the import duties entirely abolished. He might mention to the noble lord the Secretary of State that the figures he had given were given according to the way in

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

which they were used in a very interesting article in the *Daily Chronicle* that morning, and the statements there were in accordance with the mode of reckoning the expenditure and revenue which had been often placed before the India Office.

MR. KENYON.

MR. KENYON said that the complaint of the people of Lancashire against Indian Cotton Duties had always been that they were levied with injustice. He thought that the people of Lancashire had good reason to complain of the manner in which the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton had treated a deputation from them, which had waited upon him last year. The language of the right hon. gentleman had rather rankled in the minds of the Lancashire people ever since. It was contended that duties of this kind were always paid by the consumer, but when the duties were unjustly levied, the producers always suffered by it. The right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton had referred to the report of Mr. Campbell, Collector of Customs, Bombay, in which he said that "There is more weight, at least in theory and in possibility, in certain of the objections taken by Manchester to the existing excise arrangements than either the Millowners' Association or the Chamber of Commerce admit." He went on to say: "That the difficulties in working the proposed exemption of yarns and cloth of 20's and under, and still more in taxing both yarn and cloth of 20's and over, are so grave as to make the proposal to tax cloth and exempt yarn the only practical solution of the question." He further said: "Reduction from 5 to 3½ per cent. takes from the objections all or nearly all of their practical significance." In a Report from the Upper India Chamber of Commerce, Cawnpore, there was a remark that bore very importantly upon the question of the supremacy of British Government. The Report stated: "And in finish and dye India cannot at present produce as good drills as England, but the difficulties are gradually lessening, and the moment Indian weavers and dyers attain the necessary skill, English drills must cease to be imported." The great authority on this question, and the most powerful movers in opposition to English goods, were the Bombay Millowners Association. They said that, if the Government were willing, both the English and the Indian manufacturers would be glad to have the duties abolished. They alleged that the Indian industry was penalised on stores, and lastly, and most important of all, that there must be decided protection given to handlooms. A better authority, than, he thought, almost anyone in that House, was the Ahmedabad Millowners' Association. Then there was another witness as regarded the handloom weavers, Mr. Playfair, who thought that if it were possible to extend help to this class, it would be but assisting a section of the community which had suffered much by the introduction of powerloom manufactures—a relief which should not be grudged. The hon. Babu Mohiny Mohun Roy thought that this change was not likely to affect the interests of cotton mills to such an extent as to render it objectionable. He thought the House would be satisfied that this arrangement of the noble Lord would not do any harm, and he was quite certain that the course he had taken in reducing the duty was far more equitable than the arrangement they had before.

MR. J. F. OSWALD.

MR. J. F. OSWALD said, as one of the members representing Lancashire, he had sat out this interesting, animated, and exhilarating debate on the Indian revenues. (Laughter.) He thought that, as all the Lancashire members were in a congratulatory mood, he would take the liberty of offering his congratulations to the noble lord on the satisfactory basis that he had for the present settled with regard to the vexed question of the Indian Cotton Duties. The noble lord had found this to be a very vexed question during the late election last year. (Laughter.) He desired to ask the noble lord whether it was the fact that the full amount authorised to be expended upon railways in India had not been expended in the last financial year. If that was the case, he hoped that the full amount would be expended in future, because they attached the greatest importance to railways in India for opening up the trade of the country. He hoped, also, that he would do all that was possible in pushing forward the construction of the railway mileage which had been sanctioned.

MR. COHEN.

MR. COHEN complained of the way in which the Government advertised the sale of Indian Bills, and stated that it enabled those who wished to do so to take advantage of the Indian exchequer.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, who was very imperfectly heard, said the general discussion had been so friendly that he had very little to answer. In regard to the question raised by his hon. friend who had just spoken, he was assured by his official advisers that the system was as good a one as could be devised, and one of the highest banking authorities in the United Kingdom had also assured him that that was the case. As to railways, it was intended that all the money voted for railways should be spent, and not only this year, but the same rate of expenditure would be maintained for the next few years. The complicated but important matter to which the hon. member for Bethnal Green had called attention was one to which the Indian Government were giving great attention. The change urged would involve great expenditure, but gradually the Indian Government were working in that direction. As to the tariff which he had substituted for that of the right hon. member for Wolverhampton in respect of the cotton duties, he did not think there would ever be peace on the question as long as there were differential duties. He reached his conclusions after consultation with the best authorities, and, curiously enough, Sir J. Westland arrived at just the same conclusion. Various suggestions had been made to secure economy. The Indian Government were doing their work well in controlling expenditure, and while they were doing that, the wisest thing which the House of Commons could do was to leave them alone. (Cheers.)

The following Resolution was thereupon agreed to and reported to the House:—

"That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1895, was Rx. 95,187,429; that the total Expenditure in India and in England charged against the Revenue was Rx. 94,494,319; that there was a Surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of Rx. 693,110; and that the Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works not charged against Revenue was Rx. 4,446,231."

August 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN ARMY.

Sir H. HAVELOCK-ALLAN asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the debate last night on the Indian Budget speeches regarding the Indian army, whether he could state to the House that the Royal Commission presided over by Lord Welby would be directed, either during the recess or early next year, to take evidence about the officering of the Indian army on the points raised by some remarks recently made by Viscount Wolseley, Commander-in-Chief.

Lord G. HAMILTON: My hon. and gallant friend will see that a Financial Commission presided over by Lord Welby is hardly a proper tribunal for enquiring into the efficiency of the Indian army. I noticed what my hon. and gallant friend said last night. His observations were endorsed by Sir Henry Brackenbury, and I will gladly consider them; but, on the other hand, I must have regard to the financial consequences which they may entail.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

ROYAL COMMISS ON ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES BY MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

FULL EXTRACTS FROM THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

In the Examination of Witnesses before Lord Welby's Commission, appointed to enquire into the Administration and Management of Indian Expenditure, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has consistently emphasised a particular point of view which is familiar to readers of his speeches and writings. It has, therefore, been found convenient, especially as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been subjected to misrepresentation, to extract from the reports of the Royal Commission all those portions of the proceedings in which he has taken any part. It is hoped that, in this way, the economic considerations upon which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroj specially desires to insist may be presented to the public adequately and as a whole.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

2nd day. Wednesday, 6th Nov. 1895.

Witnesses. SIR HENRY WATERFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B., Financial Secretary at the India Office.
MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I., Controller and Auditor-General of the Government of India.

In the course of the examination of these witnesses upon the subject of Provincial Revenues, Mr. NAOROJI asked (Q. 715):

Would it not be desirable to ask Sir Henry Waterfield to supply us with a statement of all the additions to rates and taxes, of new taxation, and the enhancements of land assessments and consequent enhancement of provincial rates during 30 years?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I suppose you are talking now of the increase of the revenue arising therefrom, both Imperial and provincial.—Mr. NAOROJI: If we have a direct statement of the increase—of the increase of rates, assessments, and so on—we will be able to judge much better than merely by an assertion?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I am afraid it would be impossible in this country to give you a statement of the increase of revenue arising from new settlements.

716. Mr. NAOROJI: You can get it from India by next year?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I do not know what means the Government of India would have of compiling such a statement. In every province there is a re-settlement constantly going on, and in 30 years every district will be re-settled.

717. Mr. NAOROJI: What I want is a statement of increase by the mere increase of prosperity and of increase by taking more from the people? Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes, such a statement might show whether the Government is taking more from the people.

718. Mr. NAOROJI: It is very desirable that the Commission should be able to come to a correct judgment upon the point, because this has been two or three times mentioned just now, as to the margin that is owing to increased prosperity.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN continued the examination.

Mr. NAOROJI: This conversation makes it clear that it is very desirable that we should have something like detailed information. That I now ask.

736. CHAIRMAN: I think that question that Mr. Naoroji raises we had better discuss when we have Sir Charles Bernard?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I think so; he will be able to tell you what can be done.

Later,

756. Mr. NAOROJI: There is another question that arises from the suggestion about the prosperity of the country, that we should have that note of Sir David Barbour's, in which he calculates the total production or income of the country, and then if we have similar calculations from that year to this, we shall then be in the very proper position of knowing whether there is really an increase of prosperity or not.

757. CHAIRMAN: What do you say would be the basis of the comparison?—Mr. NAOROJI: Sir David Barbour, I understand, has prepared a note in the year 1882, giving the total production of the country of British India per head, and if we have similar returns and calculations from that year to this, we shall then be able to clearly prove whether there has been really increase of prosperity or not. It would be a very important thing that that should be done?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I am afraid that question of Mr. Naoroji's has already been asked in Parliament several times. It has been referred to the Government of India, who have said that it is impossible to prepare such a statement with any advantage.

758. Mr. NAOROJI: It is not impossible, because it is done. —Sir H. WATERFIELD: I said with any advantage.

759. CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. Naoroji, will not that question be best discussed with Sir David Barbour? If the Indian Government say that they cannot do it, Sir David would no doubt be ready to tell us on what basis he based his calculation?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I am afraid it is hardly a matter for Sir David Barbour. Sir David Barbour was at that time in a comparatively subordinate position. He was an Accountant-General, and was deputed on a special duty, to endeavour to ascertain the incidence of taxation. He wrote a confidential memorandum on the subject. I do not know in what way the member of the Commission learned that there was such a paper. Oh, yes, I do know how he knew that such a paper existed, for it was alluded to in the financial statement, but it has never been published; and when Mr. Naoroji asked in Parliament whether a similar paper could be prepared, a reference was made to India for the purpose. The Government of India said that they were not prepared to stand by this estimate, which had never been adopted by the Government, nor were they disposed to have another inquiry of the same kind, for they felt that no good results would arise from it, and they declined to prepare such a report. I do not think, therefore, that it would be of much use for the commission now to ask for it again; the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

Government have thoroughly considered it, and they have said that they could not do it with advantage.

760. CHAIRMAN: If we have Sir David Barbour here of course we can ask him upon what data he went when he made his former calculations, and whether he could make a similar calculation now?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes, but he is not the officer who would have to make it now.

761. CHAIRMAN: No, but he might be able to find the same data, or similar data, now?—Sir H. WATERFIELD? You will be able to put the question to him.

762. Mr. NAOROJI: As to that statement not being used by Government, you remember that Lord Cromer actually used that statement in his speech, and based certain questions and conclusions upon that statement?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: You are quite right, he quoted one statement that was in it.

763. Mr. NAOROJI: So it is better that the Commission should know what it is, in order to be able to judge the real prosperity; otherwise there is a great deal said of that kind—that there is increase of prosperity—but we must have the proper data?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

Later, Sir W. Wedderburn put questions regarding financial control and the appropriation audit.

1001. Mr. NAOROJI: When on account of the error in the estimates owing to the Afghan War, a committee was appointed here which recommended a certain scheme, and with regard to that scheme of a complete audit and so on, the Government of India said: "The organisation would certainly be far more perfect if the Auditor-General and his subordinates exercised no executive or administrative functions whatsoever. The question is mainly one of money. It is obvious that, if the Auditor-General and his subordinates were to carry out annually in detail an administrative audit of the whole of the accounts in all departments, a very large establishment would be required. The expenses of such an organisation would be so great that we think the idea may be at once set aside." So, then, in order to have this, what would certainly have been a very great improvement, or very important, has been set aside on account of want of money, has it not?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: The proposal was put aside on account of the expense.

1,002. Mr. NAOROJI: Then the Government of India proposed a certain reduced scheme instead, costing about a lakh and 53,000 rupees?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

1,003. Mr. NAOROJI: Then, again, on the side of the Secretary of State, he did not allow it?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

1,004. Mr. NAOROJI: He asked the Government of India to reduce that as well?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: He asked them to reconsider it.

1,005. Mr. NAOROJI: The Government of India then proposed 55,000 rupees?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

1,006. Mr. NAOROJI: Even to that the Secretary of State for India objected, to a certain extent, and sanctioned 51,000 rupees, allowing Sir J. Westland a special allowance?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

1,007. Mr. NAOROJI: Well, all this means, then, that if there were means, an improvement of this kind would have been very great, and it was only the want of means that induced the Government of India to ask that proposal to be set aside?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I do not think that the Secretary of State ever expressed the opinion that the proposal for an independent auditor would necessarily be a great improvement. The Government of India having accepted the view of the minority of the Committee that it would be a great improvement, the Secretary of State said that he thought the expense prevented its being carried out, and they then considered what could be done.

1,008. Mr. NAOROJI: I am giving actually the words of the Government of India that it regarded it as important?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: The Government of India did accept it.

1,009. Mr. NAOROJI: And had they had means, they would have been glad to have carried it out?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: That was the view of the Government of India of that day.

1,010. Mr. NAOROJI: In this memorandum, at page 48, there is a table giving the number of officers and clerks, and the annual cost comes to about 60 lakhs of rupees?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Yes.

1,011. Mr. NAOROJI: Now, suppose, Mr. Jacob, the Government gave you a free hand to devise a perfect scheme, so that without any difficulty about means you might go to all necessary expense, what do you think would be the cost of such a scheme over and above this 60 lakhs of rupees, just approximately?—Mr. JACOB: I should find it very difficult to give any idea offhand.

1,012. Mr. NAOROJI: 50 per cent., 100 per cent., or anything like it?—Mr. JACOB: I think the present audit is quite sufficient.

1,013. Mr. NAOROJI: The opinion of the Government of India, as I read just now, showed that had there been more money there would have been so much improvement and a more perfect audit would have been organised. As the want of money prevented them from doing that, still they have shown that if you had more money you would be able to devise a more perfect scheme, according to the view of the Government of India? Sir HENRY WATERFIELD: I have already said that I am not at all sure that that was accepted by the Secretary of State.

1,014. Mr. NAOROJI: I am not saying that it was accepted by the Secretary of State; I am only just saying that, as the Government of India gave us to understand that if such a thing could be done it would be desirable, but that want of money would prevent it, therefore let such a scheme be put in theoretically. Suppose the Government of India could have supplied and found the money, how much more would have been necessary, and instead of going to a matter of 55,000 rupees as a small addition, how much more would have been required to carry out what the Government of India thought a thorough organisation?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: They gave what would probably be the cost of the original scheme. I think that this is the lakhs and the 50,000 that you quote. They said that was the most that could be done. I think that is on page 18—1,53,168 rupees. That is the estimate that they made at the time, of the cost for carrying out the suggestion for an independent appropriation audit.

1,015. Mr. NAOROJI: In fact, they put the suggestion altogether aside, and suggested that a modest scheme to the extent of a lakh and 50,000 rupees would do for the present: that is what they would recommend?—Sir H. WATERFIELD; Yes, they said that the expense of such an audit in full detail would be so great that they thought the idea must be at once set aside. The plan they proposed was a reduced scheme costing a lakh and 50,000 rupees. Therefore, it is quite clear that, if the Government of India had desired a more effective audit it would have been very much more expensive.

1,016. Mr. NAOROJI: I am only giving the views of the Government of India myself?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Of the Government of India of that day.

1,017. Mr. NAOROJI: I can only speak from what is put before me. Can you tell us how much of this 60 lakhs of rupees is paid to Europeans?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Mr. Jacob may know.

Mr. JACOB: I could not say off-hand.

1,018. Mr. NAOROJI: We will have an approximation. Perhaps to-morrow some figures may be put in which will enable us to come to some approximate amount, whatever that is, be it 20 lakhs, or 30 lakhs, or whatever it may be?—Sir HENRY WATERFIELD: I will see if I can give you any figures to-morrow. I will make a note and see about that.

1,019. Mr. NAOROJI: Now, in a dispatch of the Secretary of State for India, dated the 17th July, 1879 (I do not think it will be necessary for me to refer to it), in the little extract which I read, the Secretary of State said:—"I have already expressed my decided opinion that the salaries to be appropriated to native gentlemen serving in their own country must, in justice to the taxpayer of India, be fixed at a lower rate than those which have been found necessary to attract the members of the existing Civil Service to leave their homes, and I think it desirable at once to lay down a clear rule on the subject. After mature consideration Her Majesty's Government has decided that the salaries to all native gentlemen appointed under the new rules, except probationers, shall not exceed two-thirds of the salaries assigned to English civilians." That is the Secretary of State's despatch. Now, supposing that the Government thought it desirable to increase that Indian contingent, there would be immediately a saving of 33⅓ per cent., would there not?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: No.

1,020. Mr. NAOROJI: That is to say, for the same number of native officials appointed in place of Europeans. Supposing Indians were appointed, and their salaries were two-thirds what was being paid to English civilians, there would be a saving of 33⅓ per cent. in their salaries?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: If appointed when vacancies occurred.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

1,021. Mr. NAOROJI: If appointed when opportunities should be made; I do not say, to appoint immediately?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I thought you said, immediately.

1,022. Mr. NAOROJI: Without any prejudice to existing interests if the Government of India carried on a scheme by which the English Civil Servants were displaced and their places taken by native gentlemen, according to this standard (which might still be further reduced) there would then be a saving of 33⅓ per cent. in money, so the Government of India would have at its disposal 50 per cent. more servants than it has at present, would it not?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: If the officers were appointed on two-thirds of the existing salaries, and were equally efficient, there would be a saving of one-third.

1,023. Mr. NAOROJI: Then there would be this other effect of it, that whatever is paid to the Indian servants remains entirely in the country, and in point of fact does not affect the total wealth of the country. Is it not so, just as it is here? £2 11s. 8d. are drawn per head from the people here for the purposes of State, but all that returns to the people, and therefore the fund from which the State can derive its wants is always full, as it were—the ocean kept filled by rain or river—so that the Government is able to draw as much as may be absolutely necessary. That would be the effect if the Indian Civil Service was so much Indian?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: If the money is spent in the country it remains in the country, and it is conceivable that it might be taxed.

1,024. Mr. NAOROJI: That would therefore increase, or rather preserve and enable the people to increase the fund from which the Government has to draw for its own purposes; of course any waste or extravagance is quite a different thing. Now there is another question. Can the administration and management of the expenditure of any individual or of any people be more satisfactory, or can it be effected in a more responsible manner than by that individual or that people. Supposing they had the administration and management, or at least a potent voice in the administration and management, of that expenditure?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: It depends very much on the character of the people, I should say.

1,025. Mr. NAOROJI: If I am to spend my own money, I shall certainly be more careful how I spend it than if I spend for somebody else, to whom I am entirely irresponsible, and have also an interest in the expenditure, and I will not give the same anxiety to see that the expenditure for another person is not more, or not unnecessary, or that it is as much as is absolutely necessary. That is only natural?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: I do not think I can admit that. Many a man cannot be trusted with his own money; someone else will look after it better for him.

With reference to the discussion on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons:—

1,130. Mr. NAOROJI: Can any member of the House of Commons at all propose any motion to reduce any item in a budget when that budget is brought forward, or is it simply a form that such and such has been the budget adopted? Can any member propose a motion that a certain item, say the salary of the Viceroy, should be reduced by 5,000*l.*?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: The motion which is proposed is simply a formal record of the accounts. A member can bring forward a motion that some expenses in India ought not to be allowed, but that would be a distinct motion.

1,131. Mr. NAOROJI: That is when the Speaker leaves the chair to go into Committee?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: On the motion to go into Committee.

1,132. Mr. NAOROJI: But on the Budget itself we cannot propose any amendment to any item in the Budget itself; it is simply a record of a fact, that such and such are the accounts?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: The resolution which is finally proposed is simply a record of facts.

1,133. Mr. NAOROJI: Then I may ask another question. I think I understood you to say that the proposal made in 1882, or the suggestion made in 1882, was somewhat different from that which was ultimately regarded by the Government of India as satisfactory; that there was a difference between the proposal made in 1882 and 1888?—Sir H. WATERFIELD: Certainly, the Government of India in 1889 thought the proposal made in 1882 too expensive.

3rd day. Thursday, 7th November, 1895.

Witness. MR. A. R. BECHER, Deputy Accountant General, Public Works Department of the Government of India.

In the course of examination upon the work of the Public Works Department, Mr. NAOROJI asked (Q 1,642):

Can you give me some idea of the amount of pay and allowance made to Europeans in your Public Works Department?—I am afraid I could not do so off hand.

1,643. You could give it, I suppose?—It could be compiled.

1,644. And you know also that the rule of the Secretary of State is that if an Indian is employed instead of a European, he should be paid not exceeding two-thirds of the salary; perhaps you know that?—Yes.

1,645. And supposing an arrangement were made to employ Indians in place of Europeans, there would be, in the first instance, a saving of 33⅓ per cent.; is it not?—One third.

1,646. Or in other words there would be a capacity to employ one-half or more as much service as is employed at present; and would it not have another effect also, that all that is paid to the Indian will remain completely in the country, and will keep up and preserve the fund from which Government can draw its own wants as necessary?—Well, I should rather doubt that.

1,647. It is a simple economic question. There is nothing to doubt?—Natives of India at present spend a good deal of money in England just as the Europeans do.

1,648. I am talking of the Indians—that whatever is paid to them is kept in the country and remains in the country; it returns to the people themselves. That is only a simple fact that does not require any doubt or argument. As the present inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is specially for account and audit as a compartment by itself, I do not think I would go any further into this matter of the apportionment.

Witness. SIR CHARLES BERNARD, Secretary of the Revenue Department at the India Office.

1,785. Mr. NAOROJI: From the evidence yesterday, it was suggested that the increase in the revenue was owing, to a large extent, to increase of prosperity of the people. I have asked Sir Henry Waterfield if he could supply us with a statement of all the additions to rates and taxes, all new taxation, the enhancement of land assessments, and consequent enhancement of provincial rates during thirty years or during any period. Till we have that information before us, we can hardly judge properly whether an increase is owing to the additional levy or additional prosperity. Can you supply us with this information; because I was referred to you as being the best person who would be able to say whether it can be supplied or not, either now or afterwards, from the Government of India?—It will be possible to say, after a time, how much increase of land revenue is due to revision of settlement. Is that the question?

1,786. Increase of all revenue owing either to increase of taxation or increase of assessment; that is to say, increase by levying instead of the increase of the prosperity of the people?—Of which revenue do you speak?

1,787. The whole revenue; because that was urged here that the increase of revenue proved that the people were more prosperous, and this matter would be cleared up if we knew exactly the whole of the information. That was the reason why I put this question?

CHAIRMAN: Must we not, Mr. Naoroji, at the present time, confine questions to the increase of taxation rates under the heads which are affected by the table that Sir Henry Waterfield put in? You see, your question would refer to the whole scheme of taxation.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Before we go into that subject it would be necessary, I think, to consult the Commission as to how far it lies within the scope of our inquiry.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I think where a witness puts before us in proof of the beneficial result of a financial measure certain figures, that there, and within the limit of those figures, we have got a right to ask whether any changes in taxation have taken place affecting that result which ought to be borne in mind as modi-

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

fying the general result shown by those figures; but I think we must confine ourselves to the items shown in that table.

Mr. NAOROJI: I am quite willing to confine myself to any portion that you may direct. Therefore, I will only say that the general conclusion should not be admitted, that increase of revenue is owing to the increase of prosperity, unless we have distinct information to show that.

CHAIRMAN: I think Sir Henry Waterfield when he spoke was confining himself to his own table, and that table is the one at 679.

Mr. NAOROJI: Then, therefore, even as to that table, even to that partial extent, we should have information as to what is known.

CHAIRMAN: I think on that point, and up to that point, you are entitled to ask questions. If you go beyond that point I think we must consider whether it lies within our scope.

Mr. NAOROJI: I do not want to go on at present. Simply because it was proposed here, and therefore I said it.

CHAIRMAN: Then, if that be the case, your question would be modified in this respect, would it not? That you would ask Sir Charles Bernard whether, over a certain period of years, he would be able to tell you what changes of taxation had taken place in the heads of revenue to which that table refers?

Mr. NAOROJI; To that extent then we will limit it, if it is so limited and so understood.

1788. CHAIRMAN: Quite so. Then now we should hear what Sir Charles Bernard thinks on that point?—SIR CHARLES BERNARD: I think it would be very difficult to make such a table as Mr. Naoroji requires—of course it could be attempted. I do not know whether reference to India would be necessary or not—probably it would. It would be very difficult to do it.

Mr. NAOROJI: If that is not done, then all I can say is, nobody is justified in drawing conclusions that the increase in the revenue is the proof of the increase of the prosperity, because, on the contrary, the position of the political condition of India, and its political drain in the employment of Europeans, notwithstanding the increase of revenue in any particular Department, would not at all prove that the people are prosperous. The people may be deteriorating, on the contrary, which is just possible.

1,789. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps, Sir Charles Bernard, with regard to that, you could communicate with us next week, and tell us whether any method occurs to you of giving the increase upon those branches?—SIR CHARLES BERNARD: What was the number of the question?

Mr. NAOROJI: The number of the question is 715.

CHAIRMAN: The table upon which this discussion arose is in Question 679.

Mr. NAOROJI: Then, in the course of further questions, I asked for the production of a note prepared by Sir David Barbour.

Sir ANDREW SCOBLE: I thought that it was settled that Sir David Barbour was to be asked about that.

1,790. Mr. NAOROJI: I asked this question, and then I was referred to Sir Charles Bernard, that I should ask him; and I will put it in another form, because we know that in one of the financial statements Lord Cromer said this:—

"It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than 27 rupees a year, and though I am not prepared to pledge myself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the tax-paying community is exceedingly poor. To derive any very large increase of revenue from so poor a population as this is obviously impossible, and, if it were possible, would be unjustifiable."

Now, I am not going to discuss that. I only wanted that we should have here a copy of the calculations by which Lord Cromer came to this result supplied to us, and if with that calculation of that particular year—1881—or whatever it might be, if we should have any similar calculations for succeeding years, we should then be in a position to see whether the condition of the people or the prosperity of the people was in any way increasing or diminishing the average per head. Now, I do not suppose there can be any difficulty in getting the calculations from the Government of India, for they actually exist in the records; would there be?—SIR CHARLES BERNARD: I think, a somewhat similar question was asked in Parliament, was it not?

1,791. Yes—And I think the Secretary of State gave a reply.

1,792. Yes, but that reply was unsatisfactory, and I want the information here?—I cannot presume to add to the Secretary of State's reply.

1793. The reply of the Secretary of State was unsatisfactory, and that is the reason why I ask you whether—the thing exists—any public records can be produced here to enable us to judge fairly what the real condition is. All I want is that there is a public record which throws light upon a very important question which we will have to discuss here, and that therefore this record will be of very great use?—I think, sir, if I may say so, that that question repeats what was put in Parliament one or two years ago, and which was answered by the Secretary of State, and I have nothing to add to the Secretary of State's answer.

1,794. What I want here is your answer for the Commission; whatever it is, let it be recorded on the Commission's reports?—I shall be happy to look up the Secretary of State's answer and submit it.

1,795. Why should it not be supplied?—I shall be happy to look up the Secretary of State's answer and submit it, but I cannot go beyond it.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Naoroji, you will recollect the conversation that took place yesterday. You will see that the witness is put in rather a difficult position. When the Secretary of State has made an answer, it must be clear that the officer of the Secretary of State can hardly go beyond that answer. There was a solution suggested for the moment. This was a calculation made by Sir David Barbour; as I understood it, it was not a calculation for which the Government of India would be responsible?—SIR CHARLES BERNARD: That is so.

CHAIRMAN: And that being the case, I thought we suggested, and I rather thought you, Mr. Naoroji, accepted the suggestion at the time, that we should reserve the question till Sir David Barbour comes, and that he was the proper person, as he made the calculation, to discuss the matter with.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, but then as it is said that the Government of India is not responsible for it, and that is the reason why I am obliged to put it in this form that the Government of India is responsible for it, because they have actually used this in an argument in a certain financial speech, and that, therefore, they have made a public use of that calculation that we ask the Government of India to produce it. That is my position.

CHAIRMAN: You are quite entitled to ask the question, but I would submit to you that the witness could not give any other answer.

Mr. NAOROJI: But I am afraid Sir David Barbour would say that he was a subordinate, therefore he did work for the Government, over which he has no control; he can give no information.

CHAIRMAN: We shall hear that from him.

Mr. CAINE: Surely, my lord, if the Government of India have repudiated this document, that particular document becomes Sir David Barbour's property. If he chooses to put it on the table of the Commission, he can do so. I think we had better wait till he comes, and ask him to lay it on the table of the Commission.

Mr. NAOROJI: The question cannot arise; the Government of India has used that document.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: Is it a confidential document? What is the nature of the objection, can you state, to producing it?—Sir CHAS. BERNARD: I cannot go beyond what the Secretary of State said.

Mr. NAOROJI: Perhaps the Secretary of State's answer may be brought here, and then we shall be able to see a way out of it.

CHAIRMAN: The witness has already alluded to the Secretary of State's answers, and perhaps the best way would be that he should put them in. I think that would be quite sufficient so far as the witness is concerned (*see at the end of evidence*).

1796. Mr. NAOROJI: Then there is another matter on the same subject. A correspondence has taken place between me and the India Office, or the Secretary of State for India, in the year 1880, beginning with my letter dated 24th May, 1880, and I should like you to say, if you can, whether that correspondence can be put here, because it is upon the same subject, and it would throw much light, as actual discussion has taken place between the Secretary of State and myself on this question of prosperity or adversity.—Sir CHAS. BERNARD: Was not the request for the correspondence also made to the Secretary of State some time ago?

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

1797. Mr. NAOROJI: Not in Parliament, I think?—Sir CHAS. BERNARD: By you: did you not ask for it?

1798. Mr. NAOROJI: I asked from himself.—Sir CHAS. BERNARD: And what was the answer?

1799. Mr. NAOROJI: His answer was that it was antiquated, or something of that kind; I do not remember. If you will bring the answer we will deal with it.—Sir CHAS. BERNARD: I cannot go beyond the Secretary of State's answer on the point.

Mr. NAOROJI: Then if you will bring that answer we will see.

Paper handed in in consequence of Question 1795.

ANSWER sent to Mr. Naoroji, M.P., on 29th March, 1893.

The Secretary of State, having consulted the Government of India, does not think it expedient to present the note prepared by Sir D. Barbour in 1881. It is now partially out of date, while some of the opinions it contains are necessarily of a speculative nature, and, if published now, might be misleading.

ANSWER given in Parliament to Mr. Naoroji, M.P., 27th April, 1893.

To the first part of my hon. friend's question my answer is in the affirmative. There is reason to think that Major Baring's statement had reference to the confidential note described by my hon. friend. The information upon which that estimate was based is from 13 to 23 years old, and the Secretary of State thinks it inexpedient to present to Parliament a statement which is now so much out of date. He has consulted the Government of India, who concur with him.

ANSWER given in Parliament to Mr. Naoroji, M.P., 5th May, 1893.

For the reasons given on the 27th April, the Secretary of State is unable to lay on the table the confidential note to which my hon. friend refers.

ANSWER given in Parliament to Mr. Naoroji, M.P., 4th April, 1895.

Considering that the statement to which my hon. friend refers was confessedly founded upon certain data, and that any similar calculation which might now be made must be founded on equally uncertain data, and might probably be misleading, the Secretary of State is unable to agree to my hon. friend's motion.

Fourth Day. Tuesday, 12th November, 1895.

Witness: SIR DAVID MILLER BARBOUR, K.C.S.I., formerly Finance Minister to the Government of India.

After Sir David Barbour had been examined at length by the Chairman and other Commissioners, Mr. Naoroji proceeded to put certain other questions.

2276. Mr. NAOROJI: Do you remember Major Baring, now Lord Cromer, having said in 1882:—"It has been calculated that the average income per head of population in India is not more than Rs. 27 a year; and though I am not prepared to pledge myself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it is sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the tax-paying community is exceedingly poor." I understand that the calculation by which this result was brought about was done by yourself?—Yes, I did make a calculation of that sort.

2277. That calculation is now in the possession of the Government of India?—I imagine so.

2278. It is not in your possession?—It is not in my possession.

2279. You cannot produce it?—If I had it, I would not produce it without the permission of the Secretary of State.

2280. Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: But you can make the calculation over again?—I am afraid I could not, because I have not the materials.

2281. Mr. NAOROJI: With the same data anybody else can?—With the same data. But I will explain how that calculation came about. I was engaged in making certain inquiries for the Government of India, and in the course of those inquiries I had to make use of data collected by the Famine Commission as to the produce of the different provinces; and about that time Sir Richard Temple read a paper before the Institute of Bankers in which he calculated the average income per head of the population of India, and he used the results given by the Income Tax in the two countries, and he calculated that it was Rs. 10 a head (I am speaking from recollection)—that the income of the people of India was Rs. 10 a head; and as I had then certain data at hand, I thought that I would make the calculation (the Government did not ask me to do it) and see what result I should arrive at and compare that result with Sir Richard Temple's figures. My calculation worked out 27 Rs. a head; so that there was considerable difference in the result of the two calculations. Of course if you ask me what value I attach to that calculation, for practical purposes, I can only say that I do not attach much value to it; but that result, Rs. 27 a head, is not inconsistent with what I know of the general condition of the people of India. If you will take it from me, the money incomes are extremely small; there is no question about that. Various men have calculated the money income for different countries, England, Ireland, and elsewhere; but I look with hesitation on these calculations, and I look with still more hesitation on the result of my own calculation for India, because I had not sufficient data. If anybody wants to convince himself that the income of the people of India is small—the average income per head of population—and will look first of all at the tables of wages which, I think, are published by the Indian Government, and then look at the results of the Income Tax in India, he will satisfy himself that the money income of the people of India is very small indeed. I know of that being the fact: but as to the Rs. 27 a head, whether it is a little lower or a little higher than it ought to be, I certainly cannot pledge myself.

Questioned by several other Commissioners as to the condition of the Indian people, Sir David Barbour stated that they were "very poor" and described them as a "most frugal and economical people." Mr. NAOROJI proceeded:

2293. What I want to know is whether this calculation exists in the records of the Government of India or not?—No doubt it exists somewhere.

2294. And it can be produced by the Government of India?—I suppose if they like to produce it they can. I have no objection: I am perfectly prepared to be examined on it; but I think you will arrive at the conclusion that the income of the people of India is very small without getting that; I have no doubt about it.

2295. I have not been satisfied with this calculation of 27 rupees. I myself have made a calculation, as perhaps you are aware, and I came to the conclusion that the average income is 20 rupees. Now that made a very great difference, and I asked Major Baring to let me see the other calculation, because I know where the mistake was likely to be made. I still wish that the Commission would ask for and obtain that calculation?—I have nothing to do with the report; it is the property of the Secretary of State, and of course as regards different men arriving at different conclusions, as I say Sir Richard Temple, who also had a great deal of information on the subject, arrived at ten rupees a head; and that shows that these calculations must be received with reserve.

2,296. We will make the necessary reserve for them, but we should have the opportunity of examining them. Now the next thing I want to ask is—we have heard a great deal about the weakness of Indian finance, and how difficult it is to make both ends meet, and so on; I now put down the question whether a portion of the expenditure administered and managed by both Governments—the Secretary of State and the Government of India—is incurred on behalf of Europeans?—Yes, a considerable portion.

2,297. For every European employed a native is deprived of what, under ordinary circumstances, would have been a comfortable living for him in his own country, as is the case here?—I am not sure about that.

2,298. Is not one native Indian displaced wherever an European is placed? Take, for instance, a Judge of the High Court of Calcutta. If he is an European, he displaces an Indian; a native would be there if it were not for the European?—On the other hand if there were no Europeans in India there might be no High Court in Calcutta.

2,299. I am not now entering into the question of the merits of the employment—English or native—I am only asking the economic question whether it is not a fact that the European displaces the Indian who would have got that place?—No

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

doubt, other things being equal, if an European is employed there is a native unemployed.

2,300. As to the policy and the merits of it, that we shall discuss at some other time. Now, besides that—that loss which arises through the European displacing the Indian—there is also this, that whatever the European wants in this country, or whatever pension he draws in this country, and everything that is spent in this country out of the revenues by the Secretary of State for India, is so much an annual drain from that country, is it not?—Well, it is money earned in the country and spent out of it no doubt.

2,301. And in the whole arrangement of the Budget and of expenditure the Indians themselves have no voice whatever?—Of course, they have no direct and immediate voice; but there is no doubt that the Government of India does pay a certain attention to public opinion in India; every Government does.

2,302. But they have no direct voice in the matter?—No direct voice as far as I can see.

2,303. By the Act of 1861 (19), without the permission of the Governor-General no member can introduce any measure (which virtually amounts to exclusion) about matters affecting the public debt or public revenues or for imposing any charge on such revenues, or the discipline and maintenance of any part of Her Majesty's military or naval forces. This means that, so far as the spending of our money is concerned, the Legislative Council is simply as if it did not exist at all?—I do not think the Legislative Council, as it is now constituted, has no influence, but it has not much direct influence upon expenditure.

2,304. The Legislative Council is of course the primary source and the authority for expenditure. It is in the Legislative Council that the Budget of India is settled?—No, it is not passed in the Legislative Council.

2,305. It is first passed by the Executive Council, and then it is legalized?—No, it is never legalized at all. It is merely read and discussed.

2,306. Then it is so much stronger on my side—the Legislative Council has no voice?—It has power of discussion. The Budget is read in the Council, and they may discuss it, but they have no other power, and if you ask me I tell you it would be impossible to give it the power of interference.

2,307. That is a different thing. I only wanted to say that the people have no voice whatever in it. All things which shall be done by the Secretary of State shall have the same force and validity as if this Act (1861) had not been passed. This gives full arbitrary power to the Secretary of State to spend what money he likes from the Indian Revenue?—I should not say it was quite arbitrary, but no doubt the control of the Indian Revenues is entrusted by Parliament to the Secretary of State.

2,308. Then by the Act of 1892: No member shall have power to submit or propose any resolution or to divide the Council in respect of any such financial discussion, or the answer to any question asked under the authority of this Act or the rules made under this Act. You have already answered that the Legislative Council have no power whatever?—Only the power of discussion; no power to interfere with it directly or indirectly.

2,309. I do not suppose this country would submit for a single day to that system of government?—They have been accustomed to something very different.

2,310. Sir Henry Fowler has said that in this country the people pay taxes for the expenditure on State purposes at the rate of 2*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* per head per annum. In India 2*s.* 6*d.* taxes are paid. Well, when you take the revenue really, it is more than 2*s.* 6*d.*?—Possibly; it is not very much.

2,311. Now the whole of this 2*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* returns to the people in this country; it comes back in expenditure to the people themselves?—I suppose the greater portion of it does.

2,312. It cannot go anywhere else?—There might be some expenditure abroad.

2,313. Abroad, yes, but that is very insignificant. I am talking of the ordinary expenditure. If that sum were allowed to India the production of the wealth of the country, from which the State has to draw, would not be impaired, but, on the contrary, as in this country, there would be increasing prosperity, and not only greater trade for British produce, but the State would be able to raise large revenues as it does here, because the fund from which the revenue is raised would remain intact in the country?—I think you exaggerate the value of that. I do not think if the Government raises 100,000*l.* in this country, and spends it in this country, that the wealth of the country remains the same as before, by any means.

2,314. It does not go out of the country?—No, but the thing which was purchased with that 100,000*l.* goes out. Whatever was purchased with that 100,000*l.* goes out of it, it is consumed.

2,315. But that is enjoyed by the people themselves, whatever is purchased?—I do not think if the Government raised 100,000*l.* to buy steel rails that, if they purchased them abroad, the country would have lost 100,000*l.* I think the country might be said to have lost the profit on the transaction, something like that—a small per-centage of it.

2,316. Mr. Caine: And the wages?—The men who would have made those rails which sold for £100,000, would, we must assume, turn their hands to something else.

2,317. Mr. Caine: They might be out of work; however it is not worth while discussing.—It is not a question of losing the whole of the money—there is a loss, but it is of what you call the profit; it is a per-centage of the total.

Chairman: Are we not getting somewhat outside financial machinery in this last question. I do not want to suggest that you should stop if there is any point that bears fairly upon the branch with which we are now dealing; but do not you think the question you are putting is as to what happens under a certain system of policy?

Mr. Naoroji: Yes. If I am able to go into other branches afterwards I am quite willing to stop here and ask no more questions. We shall have an opportunity of examining Sir David Barbour again on other branches.

Chairman: Of course we know that what we have to take up next is the progress of expenditure, and it will be a question then as to whether the progress of expenditure includes methods of raising money. The only point to which I draw your attention now is that we are now actually engaged upon the machinery of finance, and it struck me that your questions were getting a little bit outside that subject.

Mr. Naoroji: My question arose from this circumstance, that we had just now said two or three times something about the weakness of the finances of India, and naturally, therefore, I wanted to point out one particular weakness which is at the very bottom of the whole difficulty, and, if that can be disposed of hereafter, of course I have no objection to postpone these questions; we shall leave them without committing ourselves, of course.

Chairman: You will admit with me that we should confine ourselves now to what bears upon financial machinery.

Mr. Naoroji: I may also say that the weakness of finance may possibly not be fully discussed from the finance question being discussed without inquiry being made.

Chairman: I think I could not commit myself to say that a certain line of evidence will come hereafter absolutely within our instruction; but that would have to be considered. I think we shall agree that at the present moment this line of evidence does not bear upon the branch of enquiry we have got now before us.

Mr. Naoroji: I am quite willing to abide by your ruling.

Sir David Barbour: In case there should be any misapprehension I might mention that what I referred to was the weakness of the system for the control of expenditure and not the weakness of the finances or the inability of India to pay its way, the latter is a separate question.

Mr. Naoroji: I rather understood it was the weakness of the finances on account of the peculiar unstableness and unsteadiness of the finances. Then I will postpone that. Then, also, in the same way, the apportionment of charges is a future consideration.

Chairman: That will be a distinct subject.

2,318. Mr. Naoroji: That will be a distinct subject altogether. It was said here, I think, that the Government of India was to be considered as analogous to the House of Commons in respect of audit. Is not the independent audit to the House of Commons a distinct check on the disbursement of the Executive Departments, and the report to be made to a higher authority, namely, the House of Commons?—Sir D. Barbour: I am not sure that I caught the question exactly. Perhaps you would repeat it.

2,319. The independent auditor here reports to the House of Commons, while the auditor in India reports to the Government of India, and it was said that the Government of India was analogous to the House of Commons. Now, is there not this difference—that the House of Commons is a body that represents and draws its authority from the people of the country, while the Government of India is only an executive

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

body, like the departments here?—I think, when I said that the Government of India represented the House of Commons in this case, and stood in an analogous position, I meant that in the one case the House of Commons sanctioned the expenditure, and that in the other case the Government of India sanctioned the expenditure, and that so far as the sanctioning of the expenditure goes, the position was analogous. I never meant to say that the Government of India was elected by the people of India.

2,320. Then the consent of the House of Commons for the expenditure does not mean that it also is the executive body which carries out the expenditure, but it is the department of the Cabinet which is the executive body?—I understand the House of Commons is not the Executive body that carries out the expenditure.

2,321. So the report and audit made to the House of Commons is distinctly a report to a higher authority than the executive body?—Higher than the body that administers expenditure; yes it is.

2,322. While in the case of India the audit is reported only to the executive body itself?—I do not quite agree to that. It is reported to the Government of India.

2,323. To the Government of India and to the Secretary of State, which are both executive bodies?—The Finance Department is hardly an executive body. It is possibly as regards some matters, but not as regards most.

2,324. Would it not, therefore, be an improvement that there should be in some shape or another, as has already been suggested by Sir William Wedderburn, an independent audit, and an independent committee in Parliament which should consider Indian affairs so as to make the House of Commons familiar with the necessities of Indian affairs?—I do not think that an independent audit is necessary. I may be mistaken, but that is my opinion. If there were some means by which members of the House of Commons, or a certain number of them, made themselves familiar with Indian expenditure, and could give information to the House upon the subject, that would undoubtedly be a good thing; I assent to that general proposition.

5th day. Wednesday, 13th Nov., 1895.

Witness. SIR HENRY WATERFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B.

The examination of the witness having been directed to the question of "the average rate of exchange," Mr. NAOROJI said:

2,620*a*. I wanted just to understand that a little more clearly. We will take just one year, 1889-90, and the average rate is put down at 1s. 4·566d. Is that average taken by simply adding up the rates of all the 52 weeks and dividing by 52, or is it the average after taking into account the amount actually sold?—It is the average obtained by taking the total amount of bills sold throughout the year, and dividing that by the sterling amount received in respect of those bills.

Later,

The CHAIRMAN asked if the witness had any further explanation to offer with regard to the question raised by Mr. Naoroji, as to the saving that might accrue from the employment of natives of India instead of Europeans under certain circumstances, whereupon Mr. Naoroji proceeded to examine the witness as follows:

2,639. Mr. NAOROJI: There is some misunderstanding about what I mean. I just took the Europeans and their salaries, and said that if Natives were appointed in their place to rise to higher salaries of Rs. 500 and upwards, they could be appointed, or should be appointed, in justice to the tax-payer, at two-thirds the salary. Well, wherever such an appointment is made, there will be a saving of one-third—that is what I mean. I do not know how it has worked out, and of course I cannot say anything more about it than that there is some misunderstanding about what I said. Taking, say, the whole Civil Service by itself, the Uncovenanted Civil Service and all the higher pay officials, if any number of European officials were displaced by Indians, and these Indians were only paid two-thirds of their salary, the saving, therefore, would be one-third of those salaries?—Your question referred to the Account Department.

2,640. That particular department, yes. I took in that particular department, and the European portion of it?—The two-thirds scale of salary to which you refer has been adopted in regard to the natives in the Covenanted Civil Service.

2,641. In the statutory service?—In the statutory service, I should say. The exact two-thirds has not been adopted in fixing the scale of pay for the provincial service, but approximately it is so. The salaries for the provincial service are fixed at a scale which is about two-thirds of that which is paid to the imperial service. My point is that that provincial scale has already been applied largely in the account department, that the Europeans who are employed there, and the natives, draw the same scale of pay, and therefore that no reduction can be anticipated by substituting native for European agency. That remark does not refer to the few European officers at the head of the department, who undoubtedly are drawing more than natives would in their places, and to that extent I have allowed for a possible reduction, although I do not think it would be effected in practice.

2,641*a*. Mr. NAOROJI: Well, I will not go further at present, because I say that there is some misunderstanding. I am only talking of those Europeans who are paid on the European scale of salaries?—Yes.

2,642. And if Indians were placed in their places, they would receive so much less?—Yes.

2,643—4. That is only one element of saving, where the European is paid at the European scale of salary, while an Indian substituted for him would receive two-thirds. That is all I mean. I see your point, but you must not suppose that on the 60 lakhs in the accounts departments, anything like one-third could be reduced by the substitution of native agency for Europeans.

2,645. I do not say that it could be reduced. I only wanted to direct attention to the rule of the Secretary of State, to show that if the rule is enforced in all the higher departments, there will be so much saving?—Yes.

2,646. Have you made a calculation regarding what you stated just now, giving the details of how you worked it out, or only the statement?—I have only given the calculation for what it is worth. If you wish to have it accurately, we must refer to the Government of India.

2,647. I mean this particular statement that you made just now, in which you calculated that the difference would be only so much?—Yes, I have not put in the details.

2,648. Perhaps you can supply me with the details by which you made this out?—If Mr. Naoroji would allow me, without troubling the Commission—it is a very imperfect calculation—I will show him how I arrived at my figures.

2,649. That is all. I do not want to trouble the Commission with all these details. That is all I mean?—I will do that.

6th day. Friday, 15th Nov., 1895.

Witness. SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN.
formerly Finance Minister of the Government of India.

During the course of the examination of this witness Mr. NAOROJI, addressing the Chairman, said:

I want a little explanation from you, my lord. I understand from our conversation last time that we are at present considering the system or method, or mechanism, rules and regulations and powers and control of auditor, accountant and Finance Minister, but the question of the character and efficiency of that expenditure with its economical and financial or other effects, and the persons or the motive power which carries out this whole mechanism has to be deferred?

CHAIRMAN: I think what we have said was that we would deal first of all with the mechanism of the administration. The question of the progress of expenditure forms a separate branch which could be more conveniently taken at the second series of sittings.

Mr. NAOROJI: That would include the expenditure on the manning, and the whole personnel of the service, and so on—the whole expenditure, in fact?

CHAIRMAN: When we come to the progress of the expenditure,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

if you are desirous of raising the question as to whether we can go into grievances, the Commission will have to settle the points at the time. I do not think that grievances come within the purview of our enquiry. But at all events that would not form part of the machinery of administration as I understand it; now we want to get the mechanism.

3197. Mr. NAOROJI: It is the mechanism we want to get at. Now, I will only put one question as regards the difficulty of finance, and so on. Is it not a great weakness in finance that, as in this country, the people or taxpayers in some suitable way have no direct interest or voice in finance?—Is it not a weakness in finance, do you say?

3,198. Yes, if the people had any direct voice and direct interest in the settlement of the finance and the expenditure of everything, would it not be a great strength to the Finance Minister? while at present, having no such support of such interest from the people themselves, it is a great weakness in the finances?—It is difficult to answer the question in that form, quite. It might be a weakness or it might be a strength to him.

3,199. Consent of the people is the great strength of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?—So far as he could obtain the opinions of the people, and use them in support of his views, it would be a source of strength to him.

3,200. But it is not merely the opinion of the people expressed outside, but some direct voice, some representative of the taxpayer in the Council, who can actually give a voice as to any particular expenditure. At present the budget is entirely the result or the work of the Executive; the people have no voice in it at all, whether they should diminish that expenditure or increase that expenditure. As it is here, you you get six months in discussing the budget and seeing what the expenditure ought to be?—That is a hypothetical case on which I find it difficult to express any direct opinion. In other countries it has been found to be of use I believe, and presumably, therefore, it would be so in the case of India.

3,201. Of use, yes, that is all I wanted, that would be a very great strength to the Finance Minister, or the settlement of finance, if some such voice was given to the people, direct voice, I mean to say, and direct interest. That is all. I do not want to ask any more.

Eighth day, Thursday, 27th February, 1896.

Witness: COLONEL R. WACE, R.A., Inspector-General of Ordnance, Bengal.

The witness, in the course of examination on the means of production of the implements of war, stated that his department could not make a rifle barrel in India, whereupon Mr. Naoroji remarked, "You can make one if you choose." The witness having expressed a doubt as to whether the manufacture of these articles would pay, Mr. Naoroji said that "only the first new capital laid out would be necessary, that is all."

Later, it having been stated that a comparison of accounts would show the effect upon expenditure of the cost of labour, Mr. NAOROJI remarked:—

4006. That would be affected somewhat by the higher salaries and pay paid to the supervisors; that is to say, the European agency; and, notwithstanding, there is still an economy?—Yes, but the supervising charge is separate from the labour.

The examination proceeded on the question of the relative amount of labour done by an English artificer and a native artificer. The witness having stated that, given good tools, the Indian workman would compare favourably with the Englishman, Mr. NAOROJI asked (4096), "The quantity of work?" to which question the witness replied, "Yes, and the quality."

Later, Mr. NAOROJI asks:—

4176. If sufficient encouragement and training were given to natives, would they not be able to come up to any level of any Englishman, and, drawn from a better class of men, should we not be able to get as good skilled persons as you can have among Englishmen?—Do you refer to the supervision or the actual labour?

4,177. To skilled labour, to supervision in any department?—I think, as far as regards labour, that it is very good, but I do not think we could get really good native supervision. You must have men who have been trained in factories in England.

4,178. Well, if you give sufficient encouragement to train them there, and then give them a finish here, you can get such men?—Can we get such men?

4,179. Can you?—Well, we have not employed any natives of India in supervising the staff.

4,180. You have not employed them, and that is just the reason why you cannot get them; but if encouragement were given, and sufficient standard put down, to say that if anybody qualified himself in a particular way, he would have the opportunity of being employed, then will they not be produced?—Well, time alone could show.

4,181. Yes, but unless the experiment is made, it cannot be shown?—Quite so.

4,182. Mr. CAINE: If you brought a factory foreman out for a seven years' appointment, do you think at the end of the seven years you could replace him with a native?—I am a little doubtful whether the ordinary native workman would look up to a native in the capacity of a foreman in the same way that he looks up to an European.

4,183. Mr. NAOROJI: Perhaps I did not make myself clear; what I mean to say is that if the same facilities of learning and of encouragement in every way were given to natives, that you may be able to get from a certain level of natives, that you can get competent men just as well as English foremen or English supervisors; it depends upon the training, the encouragement and the teaching?—It does depend on the training, no doubt.

4,184. Mr. CAINE: But you would be afraid of—well, discipline?—To a certain extent. I think, as regards ability, you could train natives of India up to the mark.

4,185. Mr. NAOROJI: That is all I wanted to say?—They could be tried, but I doubt whether they would have the same power over a native labourer.

4,186. But then there is no reason why they should not have; the natives are the same, they have the same power in the Native State?—You think they have.

4,187. In fact, there was one Parsee superintendent of a whole Bombay factory, with Englishmen and natives under him, and the Parsee superintendent was the head of the department?—Yes.

4,188. That depends on the encouragement given and the class of natives you draw from. If you draw from the lower level you cannot get the proper stamp of men?—That is no doubt true.

4,189. But if you could provide encouragement, there will be the proper stamp of men coming out; out of 300,000,000 you can get any people.

4,189*a*. Mr. CAINE: You could get some data of experience from the railway works, probably?—Yes.

4,190. Mr. CAINE: They use Eurasians, do they not, as foremen?—I do not know them.

4,191. Mr. CAINE: Do you employ Eurasians much as foremen?—No, we do not employ Eurasians very much.

4,192. Mr. NAOROJI: There is one native of Bengal who has come over here and gone through a training in many of the factories here?—Yes.

4,193. And if he sought for employment there, I do not know whether it would be given to him or not. He has gone through the whole training and done everything, that was required of him? It is very difficult for us to know what the value of a man like that is. No one is engaged for any of our Indian factories, of whom we do not get a full report where he has been employed, and the India Office make full inquiries; we know exactly what his value is.

4,194. If you lay down some rules, and all the necessary inquiries for qualification can be made, then they get regularly admitted; but if no rules or no qualifications are laid down in order to admit natives, they cannot prepare themselves for it!—Yes, that is true.

4,195. This native that I am talking about from Bengal seems to have very valuable testimonials from all the different works in which he has actually worked. I thought you knew him?—I think I know the man you refer to, but he has been employed in blast furnaces, of which we have none. He was

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

at Bolckow Vaughan's for some time, and I have been trying to get him employment.

4,196. He is quite willing to be trained to any department, if it is once suggested what he should do?—I was going to do what I could for him when I got out to Calcutta. I think he ought to get employment at Barakur.

4,197. I do not pretend to be a judge of his qualifications, except so far as I read his testimonials, but I do not take his case; I mean to say generally, if some qualification is held out and proper training given to natives, that they would prepare themselves just up to the same mark as any Englishman. That is what I want to say?—Yes.

Ninth day. Thursday, 5th March, 1896.

Witness. MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

The witness being questioned by Sir W. WEDDERBURN as to increased expenditure in the department of Law and Justice having arisen through Exchange Compensation allowance, and whether there would not have been a saving to that extent if natives of India had been employed instead of Europeans,

Mr. NAOROJI (4,656) said:

I was only going to put the same question, that the more the native service increased, the greater would be the saving both in the original salary as well as in any such incidental charge for additional compensation for exchange, and so on?—Exchange compensation is not given to natives.

4,657. No, and that would be a saving, as well as in their original salary also; there would be a saving the larger the number of natives employed?—Yes, as far as it is possible to substitute natives for Europeans.

4,658. And then, as two Secretaries of State have thought it desirable that the separation of magisterial and executive functions should be effected notwithstanding any additional expenditure that might be incurred, it would be very important for the efficiency of justice that it should be done?—I am not prepared to give any opinion upon that point.

4,659. The increase in the judicial revenue or Law and Justice revenue has been going on increasingly every year, so that the excess or the extra charge that would be necessary before making the separation may be very well met to a good extent, so far as the surplus of justice revenue is increasing?—The revenue is certainly increasing steadily.

4,660. And, therefore, that would enable the separation of the judicial and executive functions to be carried out without much difficulty?—The court fee revenue is increasing, but it is not assigned necessarily to Law and Justice charges.

4,661. Then this inefficiency is necessitated by want of funds or want of the elasticity of Indian revenue?—I do not know that the separation of the magisterial and executive functions would be carried out but for the want of funds. I am not prepared to say that.

4,662. As I understood all along, it was on account of the extra charge that it would entail that the difficulty chiefly rests, though two Secretaries of State had considered it desirable?—All I am prepared to say is that the separation would involve some addition to the expenditure, but I am not prepared to say that that is the only reason why it is not carried out.

In the course of the examination a conversation ensued upon the rate of wages in India, and Mr. NAOROJI said (4,712): It may be that there is an increase in towns where there is congestion; but if we took wages all round in India it would be proved that they had not risen.

Later, on the subject of the payment of police (4731), Mr. NAOROJI said:

I think the question was put to you to give the figures of the amounts paid to Europeans and natives in the different departments. Now, as you go on with the evidence on these different departments, will you be pleased also to give us these figures at the time, as to what amount is given to Europeans and what amount is paid to natives?—I cannot give the amounts absolutely as they are not shown in the accounts; I could only take an arbitrary proportion for certain of the heads.

4,732. We are not able to compare properly then what proportion of the disbursements goes to Europeans and what to natives?—There was a statement presented to Parliament.

4,733. But it does not go into the departments?—No, it does not go into the departments.

4,734. It is only generally?—Yes.

4,735. I thought at this special inquiry you would give us these figures; when you come next time in giving evidence on the different departments: there we would be able to judge more accurately how large is the proportion of the Europeans, how much Europeans get in proportion to what the natives get. It would be very desirable if you could manage to give us those figures?—I will see; if anything can be done, I will do it.

4,736. In regard to the higher positions or posts in the police, is it not the case that an examination is transferred to this country in order to recruit the police department, by means of which the natives are therefore put to a very great disadvantage, just as in the other services also where the examinations take place here?—The grade of district superintendent of police is open to natives, and there are native district superintendents, but there is an examination held in London for a certain proportion of the appointments.

4,737. Then with regard to that portion, the natives are at a disadvantage that they must come here, even for these lower appointments?—I do not think that they are at any disadvantage in that respect, because a certain proportion of the posts was reserved for Europeans, even when the appointments were made in India.

4,738. But I do not know that the natives are raised to the higher position of inspectors. In Bombay I know of only one or two who are in the higher posts?—The inspectors in Bengal and in the North-West Provinces are almostly natives.

4,739. I am thinking of the posts which are occupied entirely by Europeans in the Bombay cities?—In the Presidency towns, of course, there are more Europeans, but that is for special reasons.

4,740. For special reasons natives are excluded?—In the Presidency towns a certain proportion of Europeans is required because they have to deal, to a great extent, with an European population.

Eleventh Day. Thursday. 12th March, 1896.

Witnesses: MAJOR-GENERAL SIR EDWIN H. H. COLLEN, Military Secretary to the Government of India.
MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I., Comptroller and Auditor.

In the course of the examination of the Witness Mr. NAOROJI said:—

5,345. I read an extract from a speech by Lord Kimberley made by him at the Mansion House in 1893. He says: "There is one point upon which, I imagine, whatever may be our party politics in this country, we are all united; that we are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire. That I conceive is a matter about which we have only one opinion, and let me tell you that that supremacy rests upon three distinct bases. One of those bases, and a very important one, is the loyalty and goodwill of the native princes and population over whom we rule. Next, and not less important, is the maintenance of our European Civil Service, upon which rests the foundation of our administration in India . . . . . Last, not because it is the least, but because I wish to give it the greatest prominence, we rest also upon the magnificent European force which we maintain in that country, and the splendid army of native auxiliaries by which that force is supported . . . . . Let us firmly and calmly maintain our position in that country; let us be thoroughly armed as to our frontier defences, and then I believe we may trust to the old vigour of the people of this country, come what may, to support our supremacy in that great empire." Lord Kimberley thus points out that the splendid European Army—I will not speak about the other services—is to maintain the supremacy of the British rule in India; it is mainly for that purpose that we have any British army. Then the Government of India, in a letter of the 25th March, 1890, given in one of the papers placed here, says: "Millions of money have been spent on

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

increasing the army in India, on armaments and on fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies, or to prevent the invasions of the warlike peoples of adjoining countries, but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East." And, similarly again, on another occasion, in another part of that Memorandum, there is also put down: "India is incurring great expenditure in the increase of the army, and in armaments and defences for the maintenance of British supremacy in the East," and makes it still more emphatic here—"it would be much nearer the truth to affirm that the Imperial Government keeps in India, and quarters upon the revenues of that country, as large a portion of its army as it thinks can possibly be required to maintain its own dominion there; that it habitually treats that portion of the army as a reserve force available for Imperial purposes; that it has uniformly detached European regiments from the grarison of India to take part in Imperial wars." Now I will not read any more extracts on this point, but that the British army is essential from the British point of view to maintain the supremacy of Britain over India. Is it right that the Indian revenues of the Indian people should be made to pay the whole of the expenditure of that army, or at least of the services themselves and the *personnel*, though the chief object and the chief necessity of the British Army in India is the maintenance of the British rule itself, and therefore it is to the purpose and interests of Britain that there is any British army in India?—Sir Edwin Collen: I should certainly reply in the sense of the quotations which you have made from the despatches of the Government of India.

5,346. Then the next question will be that if it is essentially for the maintenance of the British supremacy that a British army is there, and if the British Exchequer should therefore, in proportion to their own interest and purpose take a share in the expense of that army, is it not right and proper also that this share, whatever it may be, should be according to the capacity of the two countries? I can read a quotation from the Government of India. The Government of India says in another part:—"The Government of India has, however, continually objected to any rateable division as imposing an undue charge on the revenue of India; they maintain that as a question of partnership, India as a poor country should not be put on a level with rich England." Is that a right principle, and do you agree with it?—In my opinion it is so.

5,347. Then leaving this question of the whole British Army there, the *personnel*—that Britain is chiefly interested in the maintenance of a British Army in India—I will just put a question or two with regard to the frontier wars. We see from one of the returns laid here (Commons No. 91 of 1895) that during the past years there are nearly 129 millions of rupees spent from April, 1882, to March, 1891, beyond the West and North-west frontiers of India, after the expenditure on the Afghan War of 21 millions sterling. Now, in all this expenditure, I want to know whether the 129 millions includes the ordinary pay of the soldiers also or not? The items are these: there is construction of railways, construction of roads, and bridges, military works (including fortifications and cantonments), special defence works, expeditions and explorations, expenditure in the military department which is Rx. 2,544,000; does this include the ordinary pay of the soldier when he is not on any expedition?—No, it does not include it.

5,348. It does not include it, so that it will make the amount so much larger if that is included in it?—If you were to take the portion of the army beyond the frontier.

5,349. I am talking of that portion only which is touching on the frontier?—Yes.

5,350. Therefore, according to this return, there has been an expenditure of Rx. 12,857,000 from the year 1882 to 1891. Now these frontier wars, according to the repeated declarations of the Cabinets—of the Governments here—both Conservative and Liberal, were all Imperial wars. I had better read an extract or two so that the thing may be more clear?—Might I venture to ask to which wars or expeditions you refer?

5,351. All the frontier wars, I am talking about—on the north-west frontier?—You mean the expeditions against the Waziris, for example?

5,352. All the small expeditions, the Afghan war and all those, all the frontier wars. Now Lord Beaconsfield, in the House of Lords, said: "That the real question at issue was whether England should possess the gates of her own great Empire in India . . . . . We resolved that the time has come when this country should acquire the complete command and possession of the gates of the Indian Empire. Let me at least believe that the Peers of England are still determined to uphold not only the Empire but the honour of this country." Then Mr. Fawcett raised the question with regard to the Afghan war, that, being an Imperial war, a portion must be paid by this country?—Yes.

5,353. And during that discussion Mr. Fawcett read an extract from Lord Lytton's speech, in which Lord Lytton said:—I came to India, and just before leaving England for India I had frequent interviews with Lord Salisbury, the then Indian Secretary, and I came out specially instructed to treat the Indian frontier question as an indivisible part of a great Imperial question, mainly depending for its solution upon the general policy of Her Majesty's Government." This was the declaration made by Lord Lytton in the name of Lord Salisbury; and then Mr. Fawcett insisted upon regarding it as an Imperial war, and on that occasion Mr. Gladstone emphatically endorsed the opinion put forth by Mr. Fawcett, and said that it was a really Imperial question, and I may be able to read a great many extracts, but I do not think it would be necessary, because all these wars beyond the frontier are specially for the purpose of taking necessary precautions, as it is alleged, against any Russian invasion, and it matters both as to the European position as well as to the Imperial character of the British Empire. I therefore ask you whether it is right that the British Government should not pay a portion of the expenditure incurred in all these frontier wars?—If I may venture to say so, I should draw rather a sharp distinction between expeditions which might be called of a local character or interest, and any large campaigns which were engaged upon in following out a certain Imperial policy. For instance, I should say that a campaign on the South-east frontier against the Akas or the Abors, or some of the wild tribes between India and Burmah, or some of the tribes on the North-west frontier, who possibly raided on some of our subjects, and came down and crossed the frontier or approached the frontier and gave us a good deal of trouble, those, I maintain, are justifiably paid by the Indian revenues. With regard to the larger wars, if they are engaged upon by reason of following out a policy which has for its object the maintenance of our power not only in India but in the East generally, then I think that we may fairly claim that England shall pay a reasonable part of these expenses. That, in the instance you have quoted, of the Afghan War, was done, to some extent, because a contribution of five millions was made.

5,354. With regard to these tribes, if they are contiguous to the border, and harass our people, it may be that in defence and in preventing them from doing so, you may have these small wars; but then if you specially go, as it were, to secure the gate of the Indian Empire, and take every possible step in order to gain that object, all that will come under the Imperial policy and for the European position of Britain?—That is my view, certainly.

5,355. Then I will go further with regard to the wars outside of India, with which India has nothing whatever to do, such as in Egypt, Africa, or Abyssinia, or any of those places, if the Government of England uses the Indian Army, is it not right and just that they should pay for the whole expenditure of that army instead of putting on India even the ordinary pay of the soldiers that are used in this way?—As you are aware, an argument has been used in these cases that you cannot dissociate the object of the expeditions from India. Take Egypt; it was said that it was the high road to India, and, therefore, India was interested. But I think in the case of Abyssinia and Egypt, and in other instances which might be quoted, the whole of the charges should have been borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

5,356. Then now comes the question of the capacity of the two countries. Supposing the principle were as admitted—as it has been repeatedly admitted, and I could read several other extracts from the letter of the Government of India—supposing it is admitted, taking them as partners, in so far as the British army in India exists entirely for the supremacy, but India benefits indirectly to a certain extent, by preventing Russia from coming in—making every allowance for that—supposing the partnership to be admitted, what would be a fair apportionment between the two countries with regard to the expenditure

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of the British Army in India, and on such Imperial wars as took place in which India is interested, such as the North-West frontier wars; I can give you some figures here?—I am afraid I could hardly answer such a question as that.

5,357. Lord Cromer compared the capacity of the two countries as follows:—England's wealth being on an average £33 per head, India's production is 27 rupees per head, which at present exchange would be about 33s., so that is just about one-twentieth part; and Sir Henry Fowler in a speech has pointed out, also, that the taxation paid by India is nearly one-twentieth per head of all the taxation as paid in England per head. Consequently, do you not think that that would be a fair ratio of the capacity of the two countries in making any division as two partners, one benefitting largely, and at the same time being the wealthiest, the other benefitting not so much, but at the same time its capacity being so very little—a very small partner indeed compared with all the benefits that England derives from India—do you think that that would be a fair division?—I am afraid I could hardly accept any arithmetical division in such a sense.

5,358. No, the Government of India refuse to take any arithmetical division, and the Government of India insists on having it according to the capacity of the two countries.

Later.

5,370. Mr. NAOROJI: Now, to provide for the Government of India, is it necessary at all that there should be British troops, European troops?—Yes, certainly.

5,371. That is to say, for maintaining the British supremacy. If that question were not considered there would be no necessity for British troops, and Indian troops would supply every want?—There would be no India at all if British supremacy were not maintained.

5,372. Yes, then it is the British supremacy that necessitates this employment of European troops?—I should rather say that the British troops—European troops—are required for the maintenance of order in India.

5,373. Very well. The maintenance of order is also as necessary for the existence of the British rule as any other purpose, because then, without that order and law, and if this was not gained, there would be no existence for British rule, which would be very much jeopardised in every way. British people are deeply interested in everything that is done in India. Then, again, India being regarded as a part of the Imperial partnership, does India get the slightest share of glory or gain out of what is called the Imperial concern. For instance——

CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. Naoroji, may I just appeal to you for a moment? Do you not think that when we come to the question as to whether a British force ought to be kept up in India, we are getting beyond our limit?

Mr. NAOROJI: No, because that involves the very question of the whole expenditure. It is not merely the question of the amount of the expenditure that is troubling India, it is in the way in which the expenditure is carried out and used that the whole difficulty arises. Unless we thoroughly understand the character of the whole expenditure we shall never be able to judge properly.

CHAIRMAN: I think we have got a step beyond your first questions.

Mr. NAOROJI: Shall I wait till the question arises upon the apportionment?

CHAIRMAN: Well, I think it will be more appropriate there.

Mr. NAOROJI: I took the policy for granted.

CHAIRMAN: But when we get to the question as to whether British troops should be kept there at all, it would be rather the opinion of the Commission that we are stepping a little beyond our instructions.

Sir JAMES PEILE: I think it gets on to policy.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Should we discuss this question that Mr. Ryder raised, with regard to the amount that should be put upon the Indian Exchequer and the amount that should be borne by the British Exchequer with regard to expeditions outside the limits of India, now or when we come to the question of apportionment?

CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better when we come to the question of apportionment.

Mr. RYDER: I am afraid that belonged to a later part of the enquiry; I had not wished to raise the question at all.

CHAIRMAN: It was rather a matter for Mr. Ryder to ask, because Mr. Naoroji put the question how far India was concerned in this matter rather broadly.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I thought it was a very important matter to go into: but the question is, now or later?

CHAIRMAN: At present we are looking only into the actual increase of the army charges.

Mr. NAOROJI: Mr. Ryder has raised a far broader question than mine, consequently I was going to say something about it, but now as it is postponed to the other occasion I shall not interfere any more.

Later, Mr. NAOROJI examining Mr. Stephen Jacob, said:

5,623. I have just only one question. I think it was declared in some despatch by the Government of India that they were not legally bound to pay this compensation for exchange; are you aware of that?—Mr. JACOB: Yes, there could be no legal claim.

5,624. They are not legally bound to pay it?—Yes, I believe so.

5,625. And can you say that when, as was the case very often, exchange was above 2s., any account was taken of that at all in paying the salaries in those days?—I was not happy enough to be in India then.

5,626. But from the India Office you can ascertain whether they have always paid the regular rupees without any reduction at all, or so much higher. From records I daresay they can find out whether any such deduction was ever made?—I think I can safely say that no such deduction was ever made in the matter of civil pay.

In the course of Mr. Jacob's examination by Sir Ralph Knox on the subject of the payments by the India Office to the War Office of capital sums to provide annuities for retired soldiers, Mr. NAOROJI said:

5,672. As I understand it, say that in any particular year £400,000 were paid?—Yes.

5,673. This means that for those people whose annuity began in that year, out of that £400,000 every annuity would be paid for them as long as was necessary by the Government here?—Certainly.

5,674. That account is settled altogether?—Yes, absolutely settled.

5,675. In the next year new pensions arise?—Yes.

5,676. In that case, again, the Indian Government pays another £400,000 to meet all the annuities that apply to these new pensioned men?—Yes, that is the case.

5,677. And so on, year after year. What Sir Ralph Knox wants to show is that every year you pay the capitalised amount for the annuities, to be paid afterwards as long as they lived from that sum by the Government here?—Yes.

5,678. Well that I suppose is clear enough?—That is clear enough.

5,679. That has nothing to do with what was paid last year for those pensioners only who were added last year. What you pay this year is only for those who are coming on this year, and whose annuity is to be paid afterwards by the War Office regularly?—That was the previous system, but under the present system we pay the annual value.

5,680. You pay only the annual value every year?—Every year.

5,681. Has that diminished, or has it increased?—Well, it is actuarially calculated, it is not the actual value, but it is the annual value calculated for the one year only.

5,682. You pay the annuity for that year only, and not the capitalised value?—That is so.

Later, Mr. NAOROJI said:

5,703. I want to ask just one figure. Can you give me the total amount for any one year of the salaries of soldiers and the pay of officers; European officers and European soldiers?—I am not sure that that could be given.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

5,704. European military officers and European soldiers, the total pay and expenditure, and also the total pension of soldiers. All the officers I think we have in the return; it is the soldiers' pay and personal expenses or allowances I want?—I will see if any such statement can be prepared.

12th day. Thursday, 19th March, 1896.

Witness. MAJOR-GENERAL SIR EDWIN H. H. COLLEN.

In the course of the examination of the witness,

5,793. Mr. NAOROJI: Has not the Government of India objected to the short service army as disadvantageous, and recommended that a longer service would be advantageous to India?—It has made several representations on that subject.

Later, upon the question as to whether India paid any portion of the charges under the system of army apportionment, Mr. NAOROJI asked:

5,838. Supposing the Government of India were consulted, is it not possible that they might on certain occasions have refused to acquiesce in the arrangement, though high authority compelled it; but the Government of India should have an opportunity of declining to accept it?—They may represent to the Secretary of State that they do not think the charge should be incurred, and then it is for the Secretary of State to decide whether it shall be incurred or not.

5,839-40. Then that is a decision only of higher authority, without the consent or with the goodwill of the Government of India themselves, as representing India?—No.

Later, when the witness was under examination upon the charges paid by India for the recruiting service, Mr. NAOROJI said:

5,953. But when the recruit is sent to India he is not sent simply as if India were an independent territory, and for Indian purposes only; he is sent there because British rule is in India. It is for the sake of British rule that they are sent there; a consideration must be made about that?—Yes.

In reply to Mr. NAOROJI, the Witness stated that Lord Northbrook had said that India, in the case of the Mutiny, was charged with the cost of raising the men.

Thirteenth day. 25th March, 1896.

Witness. MAJOR-GENERAL SIR EDWIN H. H. COLLEN.

In the course of the examination Mr. NAOROJI said:

6,577. I want first to read a few statements which are the fundamental premises on which the whole argument for all demands upon India is based. In the papers before us there is one extract from the report of the Committee of 1874, and the extract is admitted by Sir Henry Fowler. The extract is this:—"At the same time India, as a component part of the Empire, must be prepared to share in the cost of a system the expense of which may be enhanced for Imperial purposes." The Government of India sums up, in their letter of the 25th March, 1890, the principles upon which the War Office claims are made, as follows:—"The actual cost to the British Exchequer is the cost of raising, paying, and maintaining the force in the United Kingdom, which would not be maintained if the army had not to be kept up; all the difficulties in the organisation of the British army during recent years, and the grants of additional inducements to men to join the army, have been mainly due to the necessity of keeping a largely increased European force in India." Then, Mr. Knox, I suppose that is Sir Ralph Knox, said in his memorandum of the 26th April, 1889:—"That the actual cost to the British Exchequer of raising and training the force necessary to maintain the army in India, is clearly the cost of raising, paying, and maintaining the force in this country which would not be maintained if the Indian Army had not to be kept up;" and he says further, "when it is borne in mind that all the difficulties in the organisation of the army during recent years, and the grants of additional inducements to men to join the army, have been mainly due to the necessity of keeping a largely increased European force in India, it is difficult, in justice to the home taxpayer, to see on what grounds any modification can be made of this claim as the payment to be made by the Indian Government." Then Mr. Ryder put to you three or four questions, which I will repeat here. Question 5,363: "May I ask a question with reference to the first question of Mr. Naoroji—whether you are satisfied that it is quite fair to distinguish between the cost of the maintainance of the British rule in India and the cost of the *de facto* Government of India. Is it not fair to say that the *de facto* Government of India is British, but that that does not affect the duty of India, as a very large and powerful community, to pay for the cost of its own Government?" In the next question he says: "No doubt everybody will be agreed that where India cannot afford to bear the whole of the charge, England should come to its assistance. Really, my point was that *primâ facie* it is the duty of India to pay for its own Government: the fact that that Government is British does not affect the duty of India to pay." Then he goes on: "but then would you go so far as, I think, Mr. Naoroji did, as to draw such a distinction between Imperial interests and Indian interests, as to hold that the one was exclusive of the other, and that, if once you granted that an interest was Imperial, then it ceased to be Indian and became chargeable on the British taxpayer instead of on the Indian?" Then, "Surely it is of Imperial interest that every part of the Empire should be prosperous and should be defended against its enemies?" You really cannot separate the two; Indian interests are Imperial, and must continue to be so as long as India is part of the British empire, and, therefore, it is not enough to say that a particular interest is Imperial in order to prove that the charge should not fall upon the Indian taxpayer." Then he says "That grant-in-aid might be justified by the fact that India was overburdened by the charge of the Afghan war?" Another question: "It undoubtedly was an Imperial war, but so also an Indian war may be Imperial in its magnitude, and yet be still Indian?" Now, I have read these. What I have read, I think gives a full and fair statement of the British arguments, for the claim that Britain makes upon the Indian people, the premises upon which the argument and conclusion is based. I have to show that the whole of these premises upon which every claim on India is based is utterly fallacious and untenable. This necessitates my putting a few questions which I have here. The first question is, have the Indians the slightest voice in the expenditure of their revenue?—You mean the Indian nation as a whole?

6,578. The Indian people?—The Indian people?

6,579. Yes, of British India?—Not of course any representation, except through the action of the Legislative Councils.

6,580. The Government of India itself speaks in one place of the people of India "who have no voice in the matter"?—That refers to the special fact that the peoples of India had no voice in respect to the claims made by England, or the War Office, on India.

6,581. Now with regard to the Legislative Councils, is it not the fact that the Legislative Council cannot in any way affect or touch the Budget? Some members may express opinions, but they can propose no resolution of reduction or no resolution of change of any kind, and so Sir David Barbour told us here?—That is so.

6,582. So that even the Legislative Council of India has no voice whatever in the expenditure of the Indian revenues?—Well, I should perhaps qualify that by saying that they could raise interpellations on questions such as these; for instance, the home charges have been mentioned.

6,583. But they cannot put a single motion for reduction, as the Budget is discussed in this country in the House; nothing of the kind?—No.

6,584. Then the next thing is, are not the Indians distrusted, and is that not one of the reasons why Britain increased the European force, for its own interests?—No, I should say not, certainly.

6,585. That is to say, that they are not distrusted?—No; on the contrary I should say that the Government of India rests on the loyal contentment of the people of India.

6,586. That is right, that is exactly the case; the Government of India has to depend entirely upon the loyalty of the

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

people, but yet are not the people distrusted? They are disarmed; there cannot be a single officer in the army; they cannot even occupy higher places in their own services, even in India. These are simple facts I am asking; I am not asking any opinion?—I should not say that they were distrusted; but those questions of yours seem to me, if I may venture to say so, to enter upon large questions of policy which I am unable to go into.

6,587. As to questions of policy, I do not think that this Commission is precluded from asking such questions, because the reference is quite clear; it has made no exclusion whatever of any question as to policy; but still I am not putting these questions as to policy, I am simply putting these questions of fact, in order to show how far the ground upon which the whole claim is made is untenable. Are not Indians refused as volunteers?—They are not excluded, I think, if they adopt the uniform, and can speak English. Parsees, I think, are not excluded.

6,588. Not altogether, in some places; in Quetta, I suppose, there may be volunteers; but I do not know that there are any volunteers on our side; no, they are not admitted. I only point out all these disqualifications.

6,589. Sir Donald Stewart: But I think you are wrong. Is it not a fact that any native can be appointed a volunteer if he is accepted by the commanding officer of a volunteer regiment?—Yes, I think so.

6,590. Mr. Caine: But he cannot claim it as a right?—No.

6,591. Mr. Caine: As matter of fact he never is accepted by the colonel of the regiment?

Mr. Naoroji: Is not a military education entirely refused to Indians in the military colleges in this country?

Sir James Peile: Has that question anything to do with expenditure?

Chairman: You were asking about education, were you not, Mr. Naoroji, whether they were excluded?

Mr. Naoroji: Military education. It is entirely refused to Indians in this country; they will not admit a single Indian.

Chairman: May I ask what is the line of that argument?

Mr. Naoroji: I want to show that Indians cannot be considered an integral or component part of the British Empire. They do not enjoy the rights or the gains of the British Empire, while it is proposed that they should submit to every duty of the Imperial citizen. Well, I want to show that that is what they do not possess. Until they possess those rights, the argument that they are bound as citizens of the British Empire is not a correct argument; it is altogether a one-sided argument; therefore, I am obliged to point out all the disabilities of the Indians; that they have no rights and no gains of the Imperial citizenship or of the country, while these claims are made upon them on the ground that they are Imperial citizens.

Chairman: I should have thought that on that line you are entering, Mr. Naoroji, on questions which lie outside our reference.

Mr. Naoroji: No. I contend that it is not.

Chairman: Have you got the reference?

Mr. Naoroji: The reference does not in the slightest degree exclude any such questions.

Chairman: Let us look at the reference, and see. I do not want to suggest to the Commission the exclusion of any questions which come fairly within the reference:—"Whereas, we have deemed it expedient that a Commission should forthwith issue to inquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure, incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested."

Mr. Naoroji: That includes everything; there is no exclusion whatever in saying that that policy, or this or that, shall not be discussed. The whole expenditure depends upon the manner in which the expenditure is incurred. The expenditure depends, and the manner depends, upon the kind of policy or system. I may use the word "system" to avoid the word "policy," if you like: it is the kind of system that is introduced in the expenditure which necessitates all this apportionment and all these claims that are made upon us.

Chairman: What is the connection between that question and the question of policy and the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure?

Mr. Naoroji: Just this—the way in which the Europeans are brought into India, and the employment of the large European services, are for the interests of both India and England, and, consequently, I say that there must be a fair apportionment of charges in both countries between them. I will lead to that conclusion gradually.

Chairman: Perhaps you will go on, Mr. Naoroji, bearing in mind the expression of opinion which has been made.

Mr. Naoroji: That is the end, that I want to make Britain liable for a portion of the charges in both countries which are for British interests. That is the next question that I am to put here. Have the Indians any share whatever in the gain and glory of the British nation or country, just as the Irish or the colonials have? I will explain what I mean.—Sir Edwin Collen: I cannot speak for the Irish, but I think that the natives of India have a great share in the glory of the campaigns which have been won to a great extent through the valour of native troops.

6,592. In that way they have only to give their blood and their money for the enhancement of the British Empire. If that be glory I do not know. However, I will explain this: An Irishman, or a Scotchman, or a Welshman, or a Colonial, as well as an Englishman, can have a post in any of the military, naval or civil services, or in any of the services of the Empire in any part of the British Empire, having thus a share in the gain and glory of the British Empire. Are Indians in that position? With the exception of the lower services, and the few exceptions of the higher civil service, in their own country, are they not entirely shut out from any share in the Imperial gains?

6593. Yes, Imperial benefits; they have no service in the higher ranks of the army?—No.

6,594. No service in the navy?—That is perfectly true.

6,595. No service in the Civil Service here. Are we not a part of the Empire; should we not have a fair and full share in all the services in this country also, as well as in India?—I am not competent to answer a question of that sort, because that seems to belong rather to civil and political questions.

6,596. As a matter of justice merely!—But I should say that natives of India have a distinct share in the Imperial gains, because they are able to live in peace and comfort, whereas otherwise they would not be able to live at all in India.

6,597. But with that peace and comfort of the Indian, does not also the very existence of the British rule depend upon those services? If there were no peace and order, and if the country were in a disorderly state, the British rule would not be able to remain there very long; is it not for the British interests also?—That is a matter of opinion.

6,598. Then, as a continuation of that disqualification, Lord Salisbury has said (Hansard, vol. 185, p. 839), "it would be a great evil if the result of our dominion was that the natives of India who were capable of goverment should be absolutely and hopelessly excluded from such a career"; and also with regard to the present system of British administration, he said that "it creates a terrible amount of misery." How far you may agree with that I do not know?—No; I do not know that I ought to be called upon to answer a question of this kind: but I do not agree with the latter opinion.

6,599. For the little admissions Indians have in their own country into the higher civil service, none into the military and naval services, are they not most unjustly treated in being compelled to come to this country for their examinations, instead of being simultaneously examined in India itself?—That, I venture to submit, is not a question which is concerned with the military expenditure of India.

6,600. The whole expenditure is the question. I want to refute the grounds on which the War Office Memorandum and Mr. Ryder's reasons are based—namely, that India is a part of the British Empire, and is bound by all the duties of the British Empire; and, therefore, of course, you may answer just as you think proper.—Well, if you ask for my own personal opinion, I think it is a very good thing that they should have to come.

6,601. If an Englishman wants service in the Colonies, he must go there; but if an Indian wants service in his own

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

country, he must come here; is that justice?—I think it turns upon the consideration of many other points.

6,602. Do you not compel Indians to pay every farthing for whatever you choose to do for your own interests, or what you call Imperial interests, for the benefit of the British taxpayer? Are not the British services in India for the benefit of the British taxpayers, to keep his rule in India, to have the British Empire; and must he not share, therefore, in the cost of keeping up that British Empire?—I think that the cost of the service that is maintained in India is, to a very great extent, for the benefit of the native himself.

6,603.—I grant even that much, though it is not quite logically so: but is it not also for the benefit of the British themselves?—It is certainly for the maintenance of the British Empire as a whole.

6,604. And, therefore, should they not bear a share or take a share in the cost? Of course, though you employ the native army, I do not say a word. You would require that under any circumstances, whether the British were there or not; but the British army or services would not be required in India except on account of the British rule?—If the British rule is to obtain in India, I presume a portion of the British army would be required there; but I think I have given reasons before the Commission to show that, in my opinion, India should receive generous treatment at the hands of the Imperial Government on account of certain services connected with the British army.

6,605. I will not go into the many disqualifications, notwithstanding that we have had repeated pledges; we have the Act of 1833; we have the Proclamation of 1858; we have the Act of 1870 to make us something like Imperial citizens. There is the declaration on the occasion of the assumption of the Imperial title; then the declaration in the Jubilee year that we would be treated equally with all British subjects; but these pledges have never been fulfilled. Lord Lytton says that all these pledges have been avoided by every possible kind of subterfuge; therefore is it right and is it just to say that India is a component or an integral part of the British Empire? Is it not more just to say, as Macaulay once said, that it is more the slave of the British Empire than a partner or component part of the British Empire?—No, I should say that India was a component part of the British Empire.

6,606. Therefore, the theory that India is an integral or component part of the Empire, and must take its share of the expense of the Empire and not at all of the profits or interests or rights of the Empire, is not that something like adding insult to injury?—Not in my opinion.

6,607. Well, the Government of India say,* in their letter of the 10th August, 1883, "We maintain that the system itself is unjust. It presupposes that there is a partnership between the two countries, and so to a certain extent there is, but there is no freedom of contract. It is a partnership in which the rich and powerful partner is able to prescribe the conditions under which the business shall be carried on with very little reference to the wishes or the means of the poorer and weaker partner." That is what the Government of India says; I do not know how far you agree with that?—I agree with that entirely with reference to particular charges which we are discussing.

6,608. I apply that to the whole charge, everything that is for the common interest, because our purpose to-day is to discuss what are those charges which are for common interest, for the purposes of both, and what apportionment should be made.

CHAIRMAN: Where are you quoting that from, what the Indian Government says?

Mr. NAOROJI: From one of the papers here.

CHAIRMAN: What did it refer to? Should you not state what the Indian Government referred to?

Mr. NAOROJI: The Government of India's whole argument s with regard to the army charges only.

CHAIRMAN: When you are making a quotation, I think it would make it clearer to say what the quotation refers to.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

6,609. CHAIRMAN: You gave a quotation and it might refer to the whole question you are raising, or it might refer merely to these army charges. I think Sir Edwin Collen understood it referred to the army charges?—Sir EDWIN COLLEN: The army charges, yes.

6,610. Mr. NAOROJI: The Government only applied it to the army charges; I apply the language to the whole general principle involved. I must confess that I feel exceedingly grateful to the Government of India for the manner in which they have been fighting the War Office here. But is it not the fact, as I have already said—and I will just give you a little authority—that even the opinion of the Government of India is no expression of the views or wishes of the Indian people? If the Government of India says anything or asks for anything, that this or that should be done for India, it does not mean that it is the voice of the Indian people?—Well, I should hope that the voice of the Government of India would represent the voice of the Indian people.

6,611. You think that the voice of the Government of India would represent the voice of the Indian people?—I should hope that it would do so.

6,612. However, I have got an authority here. Mr. Gladstone says, in a speech in the House of Commons on the 12th March, 1880: "It appears to me that to make such a statement as that the judgment of the Viceroy is a sufficient expression as that of the people of India, is an expression of paradox really surprising and such as is rarely heard among us." That is his opinion. And he also points out what the relations of Britain are with India, and the principles upon which India is governed, and he says here—he emphasises this position by the words—"The law and argument of force, which is the only law and the only argument which we possess or apply to place the whole of this burden on the shoulders of the people of India." He refers here to the Afghan War; but I ask whether that is not altogether a true description of the whole relations between England and India?—But I should not in any case say that it was the opinion of the Viceroy. I suppose one may speak of it as the opinion of the Governor-General in Council or of the Government of India.

6,613. The Government of India; but that is not necessarily the opinion of the people of India. If the people of India were consulted whether this large British army should be kept up there or not, perhaps we would come to a very different result; is not that possible?—Quite possible.

6,614. Sir JAMES PEILE: Is there such a thing as the opinion of the people of India?—Sir EDWIN COLLEN: I have never heard of the people of India except as an expression; I mean I have always understood that India is composed of many peoples.

6,615. Sir JAMES PEILE: Very antagonistic to each other?—Sir EDWIN COLLEN: Very much so.

Mr. NAOROJI: You may call them peoples if you like or people; those who are called British subjects in British India, no matter whether they are called peoples or people; you may use any expression.

Sir JAMES PEILE: I asked whether there is such a thing as the opinion of the people of India?

Mr. NAOROJI: There is no such thing as the opinion of the people of India, because they are not asked; they have no voice at all; they are not allowed any opinion. That is the very thing I contend.

Mr. CAINE: They express it without being asked occasionally.

6,616. Mr. NAOROJI: They do express it, and that is all they can do. Therefore, it resolves itself into this: that as long as the Indians are not allowed to have a full and fair share in Imperial rights and interests, it is not right to demand from them a share of the Imperial duties?—Sir EDWIN COLLEN: I am unable to answer a question of that kind, except in a general way.

6,617. Then again, the Government of India is not like the Government of France or the United States, say, treating on behalf of the Indians on an equal and independent footing with Britain; the Government of India is simply a department as it were of the British rule, and their chief and primary business there is to protect British interests, is it not?—No; I should say it was to govern the people well.

6,618. Then I will read you a few more extracts; I have already read to you some extracts before, and I will read a few more extracts of what the Government of India say—I may say here again that they refer to the fight with the War Office, but I apply them as very important and applicable to the whole general relation between India and England. I am adopting their words. One is this: the previous questions I have put were to show that the army of India, or all the European services in India, were for maintaining the

* Appendix No. 45. Appointment of Military Charges, p. 306.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

British supremacy, and there is a strong paragraph upon that point which I have already quoted, and with which I will not trouble you now. There are further advantages, the Government of India points out in their letter* of the 25th March, 1890, to the British people. "The army of India affords (as indeed it has been clearly stated in bygone years by the Government of India) a great reservoir of military strength to England." That is the fact?—Yes.

6,619. †Again in the same letter, they say: "We may especially lay stress on the fact that the Indian army supplies a great addition of military power to England, that a large part of the British army is trained at the expense of India, that the whole of the men passed into reserve from the 70,000 troops in this country have been maintained entirely out of Indian revenues from the date of their first recruitment." In the ‡India Office Letter to the War Office of the 9th August, 1872, it is said: "It is well known that India offers the best, if not indeed the only training ground for the British army in time of European peace. . . . A very large, and certainly not the least valuable, portion of the reserve will consist of men whose entire military training and experience will have been acquired at the expense of the people of India." Further in the §Memorandum enclosed in the Government of India letter of the 25th March, 1890, the following passages occur: "India is incurring great expenditure in the increase of the army, and in armaments and defences for the maintenance of British supremacy in the East. It is surely not unreasonable to consider that England should bear a share of this burden; the principle should be that of true reciprocation, and India should not be charged on account of expenditure which must necessarily be incurred by England for the maintenance of her army and the Empire at large." . . . . "That India should be considered as affording a training ground for the officers and men of the British army, that the relative financial capacities of the two countries should be considered, and the whole matter adjusted on broad and statemanlike views of public policy." Well, I apply all these, in the words of the Government of India, to the general question of all the relations between Britain and India in regard to charges in both countries for their common interests. It was suggested by Mr. Ryder that the Government here, or the British Exchequer, was requested and prayed to show mercy and pity to a poor partner, and that it is only in that way that we are asking from Great Britain not to charge this and not to charge that. Well now, I maintain, as Mr. Fawcett did very distinctly state—he said (Hansard, Vol. 250, p. 454) distinctly he wished to explain (this was on account of the Afghan War that he said this), that so far as India was concerned, this was not to be regarded as a matter of generosity, but of justice and legality; and he again repeated the words, "the matter must be decided on grounds of strict justice and legality." And then Mr. Gladstone (p. 932) completely adopted all that Mr. Fawcett had urged, both with regard to the principle upon which the expenses of the Afghan army should have been apportioned between the two countries—viz., that of a very substantial contribution from Britain; but not on the ground of generosity or pity, but on the ground of simple justice and legality; and that is what I ask should be done. Do you not think so?—I think certainly that the principles of justice and legality should be followed.

6,620. The War Office or any department here says, such and such expenses, that we undergo, are for the benefit of India also, and therefore, India must take a share in them. Now, on the same principle, should I not also say that whatever is spent here from the Indian revenues, which is also entirely for the purposes of the two countries—not for England alone—should also be shared by the British Exchequer on the same principle? I will just give an instance, such as the India Office building and establishment, the Engineering College, the examination expenses, and a number of expenses that are defrayed here in this country, every farthing of which is spent in this country, is enjoyed by the people of this country. Taking also the cost of the exchange compensation, every farthing of which would be spent in this country. Very well, whatever is paid out of the revenues of India for common purposes, not only for common purposes, but even entirely what is spent here, should not the British Exchequer take a share in it, just on the same principle as they demand from India that we should take a share in the War Office expenditure?—Looking at the matter from an Indian point of view, I should be very glad if that conclusion were arrived at.

6,621. Then, also, even in the apportionment, supposing that for particular purposes very large expenditure is incurred which is in the interests of both countries, it should also be taken into consideration what is the capacity of each country, more especially as it is under the British administration that India has become extremely poor and the poverty is acknowledged by three successive latest Finance Ministers. I have already given you the figures with regard to the capacity the other day, and therefore I will not repeat them here again?—I think the question of the capacity or the wealth of the countries might certainly be taken into consideration in discussing the question.

6,622. With regard to these frontier wars, in which you urged the other day that the British Exchequer here should take a proper share, in which the interests of both are concerned, I do not remember that you exactly agreed with me in excepting those small frontier wars where the tribes come and disturb the Indian frontier?—Yes.

6,623. And now with regard to wars outside India, in which the chief interest is that of the British Empire, not only within the British Empire, but everywhere all over the world, taking Egypt and the British interest connected with that, or the Abyssinian expedition, or any of those expeditions, is it not just that the British Exchequer should take a fair share in the whole expenditure, or rather that they should pay the whole expenditure, not take a fair share, in that India has no concern, except that they use Indian troops, and therefore India helps with the blood of her troops to maintain the Empire outside of India?—Yes; I think that in cases such as those you have quoted, the British Exchequer should bear the expenditure.

6,624. Then with regard to the exchange compensation, and I have already quoted Lord Kimberley's words that the British services in India are for the essential purpose of maintaining British rule there, and the European officers are specially for that purpose, the argument that was urged was that if this compensation were not given, it would dissatisfy the officials and the officers and would impair the service. Very well, that service is chiefly, mainly, I do not go to the logical conclusion of it, entirely for British purposes, and in addition to that we have this consideration, that the whole of the exchange compensation would be entirely spent in this country; therefore, to say the least, instead of putting the whole of that burden of exchange compensation on India, is it not right and just that some portion of it fairly should be contributed by the British people themselves?—No, I certainly do not think so.

6,625. For this double reason, that it is entirely because they are Europeans that this exchange compensation has at all arisen, and Europeans are for the interests of both, I grant that; and that, therefore, if this European service is not to be impaired, as much for the sake of the British rule and supremacy as for the sake of the Indians, and also because the whole of the money to be spent here besides, not a farthing to be spent in India, is it not right and just that the British Exchequer should contribute a fair proportion of it?—No; I should say that it is a purely Indian service, which Indian revenue should pay for.

6,626. Not only this exchange compensation, but the whole exchange question arises simply because there are European services in India; otherwise any other country, such as China, or any other Eastern country, will have nothing to do with any difficulties or troubles of exchange, it is a mere matter of business.

Fourteenth Day. 16th April, 1896.

Witness: CAPTAIN HEXT, R.N., Director of the Royal Indian Marine.

Mr. NAOROJI examined the witness as follows:

7,130. Mr. NAOROJI: We have been considering that when the British exchequer disburses any expenses which are considered to be for the purposes of both British and Indian Governments or British and Indian people, the British exchequer claims

* Appendix No. 45. Apportionment of Military Charges, p. 269.
† " " " " " p. 253.
‡ " " " " " p. 293.
§ " " " " " pp. 270 and 277.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

a portion from us; that is to say from India. On the same principle would it not be right that whenever any disbursement is made by the Indian exchequer, for purposes in which both are interested, that the British exchequer should take a share of it also on the same principle?—That undoubtedly seems fair.

7,131. Are there any Indians employed in the Navy, or in any of those ships about which we have been discussing all along?—In the Indian Marine, the service belonging to the Government of India, the crews are almost entirely composed of natives of India, and in the Defence Squadron there is a small number of natives employed; in the Royal Naval Squadron proper no natives are employed.

7,132. I am specially asking for that portion for which we are called upon to pay this apportionment, and that is especially the Royal Navy Squadron?—That is the Royal Navy Squadron.

7,133. There are no natives at all?—With the exception of one or two cooks and servants, none.

7,134. Virtually, there are no Indians employed at all?—No.

7,135. And though India is called upon to make this contribution or apportionment towards the expenses of the squadron, India itself cannot get any share out of the service for which India contributes?—Except, of course, the defence of their coasts, their trade, &c.

7,136. Then that defence is also for the common purpose of defending the British rule in India. We are now going upon the supposition that both are common parties; it is for the interests of both, and wherever any disbursement is made, either by the British exchequer or the Indian exchequer, that the apportionment should be made on both sides?—On both sides, yes.

7,137. I suppose in Australia, the Royal Squadron that is placed there, of course, Australians are quite free to be employed in every way on that squadron; they would be able to get in; they would not be prohibited or completely excluded as the Indians are from the Royal Squadron?—No; the whole of the Australian Squadron, as far as I know, is manned entirely from England, not from Australia.

7,138. But would there be anything to prevent the squadron from being manned there by Australians if the Australians offered themselves?—I cannot answer that question.

7,139. But there would be no objection to employing any Australian, either as a man or officer, if any Australian were here and offered himself as a sailor or joined; he would not be prevented as an Indian would be prevented. An Indian would be told, "No, you cannot come in?—I think no sailor would be taken in the English navy for the Australian squadron unless he had gone through the training ships at home (I am speaking from my memory of my service in the Navy) and had come home for that purpose; he would not be entered in Australia.

7,140. But an Indian cannot do even that; he cannot be trained at home because he would never be admitted?—I cannot say whether the Admiralty would admit them or not; I think not.

7,141. I know in the Army they are not admitted, and I suppose it is so in the Navy also.

Other Commissioners took up the examination of the witness upon the subject of the apportionment of charge between England and India in connexion with the employment of the Navy in Indian waters and the Persian Gulf. It having been stated that India undertook to perform duties with regard to the Naval service, Mr. NAOROJI remarked:

7,180. We were told just now that India took all those duties upon itself. Was it not rather that the British rulers put upon India those duties than that the Indians undertook all those duties of their own defence, and so on?—Sir EDWIN COLLEN: I have never been in the secrets of the Government; I could not give an opinion upon that.

7,181. It is a mere matter of fact that all that is imposed upon the Indians is by the Government. The Indians themselves have no voice whatever in it. It is said also that the members of the Empire are on the same footing as any other Colonial people; is it so? The Colonists are their own masters; they did not submit to the British Government here to dictate to them, and at last the British Government was compelled to give them their own government. Is India in that condition? I presume the British Government do it for their good; not only for the good of the British Government, but for the good of the Indian people.

7,182. But for the British supremacy and the British rule and that, they ought to take their own fair share in everything that is done?—I am not a member of the Government and I cannot give any opinion. I do not know what the intentions were in the the least.

Fifteenth day. Thursday, 23rd April, 1896.

Witness: MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

The witness was examined at length by the Chairman and other Commissioners upon the Debt services. Mr. NAOROJI then proceeded to question Mr. Jacob:

7,507. Mr. NAOROJI: Is it not because of the conviction of the people here that the Indian Government are despotic enough, and powerful enough, to exact any amount of money from the people to pay their debts that there is all this confidence in what is called the credit of the Indian Government?—I should not put it in that way.

7,508. Then will you kindly give me those figures again of the debt held in this country by Europeans and by Natives?—Yes, Rx. 25,000,000 held in London, Rx. 48,500,000 held by Europeans in India, and Rx. 29,500,000 by natives.

7,509. Out of this £29,500,000 held by natives, can you give us any idea of how much is held by the native States and subjects of native States?—No, I could not do that.

7,510. You cannot?—No.

7,511. Because every Native State invests its balances very largely in Government of India security; and can you in any way give us some idea of the amount that is held by those foreign Indians) as we may call them?—No, I cannot give that information.

7,512. No, well I can say that it must be a very large portion, and, therefore, strictly speaking, the people of British India, who are special subjects of the British Empire, give but very little towards these loans?—I do not know at all what the proportion is that is held by natives of British India.

7,513. It must be, at least, not as much as £29,500,000, because the Native States do hold a large amount?—Yes, they certainly do hold some portion of that total.

7,514. I suppose that there must be information enough here to give us the figures of what is held by the different Native States?—I do not think there is any information of that kind.

7,515. They have got all the information by the Residents of the administration of all the native States. You cannot give it, but there is one thing certain that there is a large portion of this debt held by, strictly speaking, foreigners, either European foreigners or Indian foreigners?—Yes, that is so.

7,516. The people of British India itself can hold but very little?—Yes, that is so.

7,517. Then with regard to any accumulation of capital in British India, we have first to take into account that there are something like 200,000,000 of rupees paid to Europeans, military and civil Europeans, and that goes to the benefit of Europeans, and is entirely taken away from any accumulation of capital that the Indians themselves can make, is it not so necessarily? The natives have to pay 200,000,000 of rupees every year for the salaries of Europeans?—I do not remember the exact amount, but whatever it is, a very large amount of it is spent in India.

7,518. Yes, but it is for the consumption of the Europeans, not for the consumption of the natives. Every European consumes so much which a native would have consumed, had that European not been there occupying his place in the services in India. It is a mere matter of fact, of course, there is no opinion in the matter?—I do not quite understand what part of the question I am to answer.

7,519. What I mean is this; with regard to what is spent outside, of course there is no question in your mind, such as all the savings which are remitted to this country, and all the pensions which are paid here; that, of course, is a pure loss from the country, a pure drain from the country, is it not? It goes clean out of the country?—It goes out of the country, as far as the Europeans are concerned.

7,520. Of course we are talking only of Europeans, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

what is spent by the Europeans, there is also depriving natives who would have occupied their places, had they not taken these places themselves; that is clear?—No, I should not admit that.

7,521. Take, say, any European who gets his 1,000 rupees now; if instead of that European, it had been a native he would have got his 1,000 rupees, and he would have been provided with all that he wanted; whereas he is now deprived of it and the European gets it, his food or his shelter?—But the European spends a great deal of that salary in India.

7,522. Yes, but it is spent for his own consumption, not for the consumption of the native?—For the advantage of the native.

7,523. He consumes so much food, he consumes so much this, that, or the other—whatever is enjoyed by that European is so much taken away from a native who would have occupied that place?—As far as the expenditure in India is concerned, it is just as much for the benefit of India whether it is by a European or a native, I should say.

7,524. Yes, but his expenditure means so much consumption of the material products of the earth—he consumes so much, either in services or in whatever he consumes—which a native would have consumed if he had not been there, is not that clear?—It is clear, as a matter of fact.

7,525. Yes, well that is all I want; as a matter of fact it is clear that it is so. Now is there any indication therefore from this debt, that, because India is able to borrow so much money, that it in any way proves that British India—the Indian people of British India—have made any accumulation of capital, when they have to part with 200,000,000 of rupees every year merely for salaries? I have made no assertion about that.

7,526. You cannot say; there is nothing to prove that British India and the Indians of British India are making or accumulating any capital?—There is nothing in these particular figures.

7,527. There is nothing to show that?—No.

7,528. It cannot be asserted positively that it is so?—I think it can be asserted. I say in these figures there is nothing to prove it.

7,529. These figures do not prove anything of the kind?—No.

7,530. That is all right. Then it is said, although Australia makes capital, still it finds it cheaper to borrow from a different country in the same manner. Can we say that India is making capital, and that it only comes to England for the purpose of borrowing cheaper? Or is it because British India or the Indians of British India cannot find that money, that the Government are compelled to come here and get that money. It may be one of two ways?—We borrow in India when that is possible, because we then know exactly what our liablity is.

7,531. Yes, but when we borrow in India we find a difference that, though we borrow in India, we can hardly get it from the Indian people of the British territory. Can we get a return of the holders of any of this debt who are subjects of British territory and not foreign Indians or foreign Europeans; can we get some such return?—Possibly, some such return could be prepared.

7,532. It would be a good thing to know this exactly—what is drawn from the people of British India itself?—I will see if any information can be obtained; I do not know that it can.*

7,533. Sir Donald Stewart: But that would not prove anything; it would simply prove that the natives of India do not like the low interest?—Yes, that is what I should say.

7,534. Mr. Naoroji: It is said because they do not like lower interest; it is simply because they do not have the money to give at lower interest. The capital is so small and, for business purposes, so insufficient, that the very commercial current rate—business rate—of interest is 9 per cent., is it not? All accounts between merchant and merchant are at 9 per cent. interest, is not that a fact?—The ordinary mercantile rate of interest is certainly much higher in India than in England.

7,535. Of course if they make a special contract for any particular lower interest, that is a different thing; but what is here supposed to be regular 5 per cent interest as between merchant and merchant, there is 9 per cent. interest; and even with this 9 per cent. interest the bankers actually who possess capital to any extent—I mean the Indian bankers - are able to get more than 9 per cent. because capital is so very deficient there: it cannot be accumulated because it is taken away from the country?—I do not appear as an expert witness on questions of political economy, and I can only say that my own experience after about 25 years in India is that there is certainly an accumulation of capital going on in British India, and that India as a whole is wealthier than it was when I first went there.

7,536. Can we have any proofs; can you show any increase?—As I say that is only my opinion.

7,537. It is merely an opinion, therefore, you cannot give any proof?

7,538. Sir James Peile: Have the imports and exports increased?—Mr. Jacob: Yes, they have very largely increased.

Mr. Naoroji: Mr. Chairman, may I go into the subject of imports and exports now?

Chairman: I do not think it comes in at the present point.

7,539. Mr. Naoroji: Of these Rx. 29,000,000 we are talking about, I suppose there is some amount held in different kinds of trust?—Mr. Jacob: Yes, some portion of it would be so held.

Sixteenth day. Wednesday, 29th April, 1896.

Witness. Mr. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

The witness was examined upon the Commercial Services, and Railways and Irrigation works. It having been stated that the subsidised railways received land free of charge, Mr. Naoroji asked:

7,819. Did the guaranteed companies pay anything for the land, or was it given to them also free?—Mr. Jacob: No, it was given to them free also.

Later, asked how the working expenses of the railway were paid, the witness replied:

By drawing on the Government treasury; the railway account is treated as a drawing account with Government.

7,965. Mr. Naoroji: Does the Government keep a separate account of what is spent in that manner in keeping the accounts of the railway income and expenditure?—Yes.

7,966. Is that included in the railway accounts?—Yes.

7,967. Or does it go into the Government revenue accounts?—It is not always charged against the railway concerned, but the total charge is shown against the railway revenue account.

7,968. In fact it is from the revenue of the country that this is paid and not deducted from the revenue of the railways?—It is shown against the railway revenue, but is not always charged against the revenue of the particular railway.

After further examination by other Commissioners Mr. Naoroji proceeded to question the witness:

8,161. Is there any portion of the railway capital held by the Indians of British India, do you know?—Some small portions certainly are. The shares in the Tarkessur railway in Bengal, I believe, are held chiefly by natives, and there are a few provincial lines in the North-West Provinces, shares in which are held by natives of India.

8,162. I am talking of the capital which we are speaking of as having been spent, the £246,000,000?—Yes.

8,163. And can you say what the amount is?—No, I could not say. I do not know how much is held in railways other than those I have just mentioned.

8,164. Are you able to distinguish how much of this capital invested by natives belongs to natives of Native States, and how much to natives of British India?—No.

8,165. You have no means of saying?—No, I have no means of ascertaining.

8,166. According to a return given here, we have got something like Rs. 1,16,00,000 paid in salaries to servants on railways. This is a Parliamentary return of salaries above 1,000 rupees per annum paid to servants on railways, and you have a total of nearly Rs. 1,16,00,000, and out of this more than 80½ lakhs, or nearly three-quarters, are paid to Europeans. In that case the Indians do not get the benefit of the amount spent in India so far as the *employés* are concerned?—I should not say that they do not get the benefit of it.

8,167. As employed by them, and having so much paid to Europeans, and not having the same employment which the Europeans occupy, if Indians were employed in this place they

* It was found to be impossible to obtain the required information.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

would receive all this benefit of money expended in the country for the railways as in any other country?—Yes, if they were employed instead of Europeans; or rather, if they could be so employed, they would receive the amount.

8,168. They would receive the amount, and so that amount is lost both in amount as well as in employment to the Indians themselves?—I should not describe it in that way.

8,169. I am asking it as a mere fact that there is so much money paid to Europeans?—There is no question as to that fact.

8,170. Take for instance this country, or the United States, whatever is spent in connexion with railways is earned by the people of the country, and it goes every year to their benefit, although it may be borrowed money or their own revenue spent?—Yes.

8,171. And that is nearly three-fourths; then there is also £54,000 spent in this country in some shape or other, such as directors and their offices and other expenses?—Yes.

8,172. So it is nearly one crore of rupees which the people have to find which does not return to them, but goes to Europeans—as matter of fact?—That amount is paid to Europeans. Of that there is no doubt.

8,173. Now there is something like 200,000,000 of rupees paid in the various different services in India to Europeans. I mention that as a fact from this return?—I have not got the return, but I should not have thought the amount was so large.

8,174. And were Indians largely employed, and if even half of that had been saved to the Indians, would they not have been able to produce or supply more capital than they are at present able to do. They would have so much capital to invest in various ways, and during the time of the railway existence—all this money which has been paid to Europeans—had even half of it been paid to natives or saved to the Indians as their capital, they would have been able to supply a large portion of the capital required for the railways?—I really cannot say; it involves so many considerations.

8,175. There would have been so much more capital available in the country?—Not, perhaps, if the Europeans had not been there.

8,176. I say if the Europeans had not been there so far, and Indians had earned all that instead of 200,000,000, say 100,000,000 Indians had earned instead of all that going to Europeans who use it there and take it away from the country also?—If the Europeans had not been there, it is possible that the natives would not have been in a position to earn these amounts.

8,177. I beg your pardon; what is it?—The premise, as I understand it, is that the Europeans are not there to earn the money.

8,178. So many less employed, instead of to the extent to which they are. If that was done, and if the Act of 1833 were fairly carried out, without distinction of race or creed, in the employment of the Government services, so that more Indians would have been employed than Europeans are, and they would have been able, therefore, to save so much capital to the country itself, would not then Indians have been able to supply more capital than they are at present?—Possibly they might be. But this assumes that they could be employed in the place of the Europeans—that they could do the work.

8,179. At present, owing to this drain, there is much scarcity of capital in British India, and consequently the Indian capitalists can command a greater return for their little capital than they would otherwise do?—The ordinary rate of interest is certainly high.

8,180. The Native States have built mostly their own railways from their own revenue, have they not? Can you give any idea of what railways have been built by different Native States, how much by borrowed money, and how much from their own revenue?—I can give you the amounts expended by Native States on railways, but several of our main lines run through the Native States—the Rajpootana-Malwa, for instance.

8,181. Yes, but they are your own railways; I mean special railways built by Native States for their own territory?—There are such railways; the Nizam's State Railway, the Gaekwar's railways, the Kashmir and the Rajpura-Bhatinda Railways, and several other smaller lines.

8,182. And are all these railways built entirely from their revenue, or is any portion built by borrowed money?—Some of these have certainly been constructed from borrowed money; but I cannot state in every case the exact proportions of the capital which has been supplied from revenue and from borrowed money.

8,183. Well, I can just give a few figures with regard to one Native State. I have not been able to look into the railways of Hyderabad-i-Nizam, but I have got some figures of Mysore given by the Diwan last year, and it appears that they were able to raise a local railway loan, as it was described, of 20 lakhs of rupees, and they borrowed from the English Government a crore and 63 lakhs of rupees for railway purposes?—Yes.

8,184. Out of that they have already a sinking fund of 27 lakhs 81,000, for the loan from the English Government. They have themselves now from their own revenue spent 1 crore and 48 lakhs on the Mysore-Harikar Railway, and they have on other railways also invested 41 lakhs from their revenue only, and they have not spent nearly 16 lakhs from the loan which they have received from the British Government. The position thus stands that, out of the loan from the British Government they have 27 lakhs of sinking fund, and they have 15 lakhs in hand which they have not employed, so that we see that a large portion of the railway is built from their own revenue, and they are in a fair way of repaying the whole of the loan in this native State. We, in British India, do not appear to have any chance of coming to that condition of affairs?—I have no information about those figures.

8,185. Then in addition, on account of this guarantee to the loss that accrues from the necessity of paying up to the guaranteed interest, we have, as has been already explained, the additional loss of exchange on account of having these loans in sterling. We have a double loss; we have to make up the guarantee, which is in sterling, and then to pay in sterling; whatever may be the earnings in rupees, we must make it up in pounds, which is not earned, and, as it is called, a fictitious amount which we have to pay, which has already been discussed?—There is a double loss; first, in the payment of the sterling interest; and, secondly, in the fictitious rate of exchange which is applied in the calculation of surplus profits.

8,186. Then the question was put to you, I do not remember by whom, that taking the whole result of the railway expenditure and earnings up to this time, how much remains as a deficit to the Indian revenues which they have filled up, up to this time and which must be earned hereafter as a balance against us in favour of railways?—There is a net balance against the railways.

8,187. And how much do you think it is, taking the result from the beginning to the end of revenue?—I cannot state the amount offhand, but I will put in a table showing the net results of the railways as far back as possible.*

8,188. The extent of railways now in India is about 20,000 miles, is it not?—Up to the end of 1894 it was 19,000 miles; I daresay it is 20,000 miles now.

8,189. Have you any idea what is the extent of railways built in the United States about this time?—I have not any idea of the exact amount.

8,190. Then in the working of those railways, do you not think the Government, having direct or indirect control over it, should compel or insist upon the railways to adopt the most economical plan, and therefore largely employ Indians, and save as much as possible from the heavy expenditure. Would not that go a great way towards making the railways more profitable than they are at present?—I believe the policy followed both by the State Railways and the Companies is that they employ natives wherever they think they possibly can do so with due regard to both efficiency and economy.

8,191. Still, where you have three-fourths of the salaries paid to Europeans, as it is as present—within three or four years of this return—there is large room for Government as trustees of the revenues of the people to do their utmost to see that the railways are made really more profitable?—I think that the Companies certainly look more to their profits than to the employment of Europeans, and that they would employ natives wherever they thought it more profitable to do so.

8,192. Yes, that is more reasonable, it would appear, but with the exception of the Baroda railway, where there is a good manager who tries to make use of as large a native element as possible, they are not carried out. The great Indian Peninsula has different ideas,—I cannot mention them. Therefore, we have no capital invested by the subjects in British

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.
* See Appendices 27 and 28.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

India, and if the large amount that is paid in salaries to Europeans continues, and the indirectbenefits that non-officials derive from the trade, and from all that they do there, because the British Indians are not able to compete with them, there seems to be very little chance that the Indians will ever be able to help themselves, and become owners of those railways, or to pay their debts, if this drain continues as at present?—Some of the capital is owned by natives of British India.

8,193. Natives of British India?—Yes.

8,194. Because I know natives of Native States and even princes of Native States hold very largely, such as, I think, the Mahárája of Gwalior is lending a large amount of money to the British Government. Is it about a crore?—More than that.

8,195. Three crores?—The Gwalior loan of 1887 was 3½ crores of rupees, and there is also a loan from Maharaja Sindia for State Railways of 1½ crores.

8,196. The Mahárája of Holkar has also lent?—Yes, a crore for the Indore State Railway.

8,197. Therefore we are in the position of borrowing from every quarter; when will we be in the position of Native States of taking from their own revenue and from their own capacity. As long as this drain continues there does not seem to be much chance?—Some of the capital of the railways is held by natives of British India.

8,198. Can you give us any idea of how much is held by them?—No I cannot state how much. The amount is not considerable for the reason you have already mentioned, viz., that the rate of interest in India, on good security, is much higher than that obtainable even on railway loans.

8,199. Sir JAMES PEILE: There are no limitations in the employment of natives on railways in India except their fitness, I suppose?—Mr. JACOB: That is all I know of.

8,200. Sir JAMES PEILE: And they would be cheaper than Europeans, if fit, and they naturally would be employed?—Mr. JACOB: I should think so.

8,201. Mr. NAOROJI: If they are properly trained, and if there is a full fair opening left to the Indians, do you mean to say that the Indians—out of 300,000,000 of people in India, that you will not find a sufficient supply to do all this work as efficiently as any European?—Mr. JACOB: I do not pretend to give any opinion on that point myself. I should judge from the action of the railway companies, and railway managers in employing Europeans for certain posts, that that is the view that they take.

8,202. The guaranteed railway companies take very good care that as long as they get their guarantee and any benefit they do not care whether the Indians derive any benefit from the expenditure or not. It is an idea of patriotism among them to employ Europeans instead of Indians. You cannot say that the Indians will not be found competent to undertake the work if encouragement were offered, and if the proper class of men were drawn.

8,203. Sir JAMES PEILE: India has been developed by railways since about the middle of the century, has it not?—Yes.

8,204. During that time the opening of the railways has enormously increased the trade?—Yes.

8,205. India being an exporter of raw produce it has been particularly beneficial in opening up the country?—Yes, the railways have produced an enormous effect in that way.

8,206. Now, during the development of the railway system, have the natives taken any part in promoting undertakings such as railways?—Only, as far as I know, in the case of very petty undertakings. There is the Tarkessur railway in Bengal, which, I think, is mainly a native undertaking, and there are one or two tramways, I believe. But I cannot speak on this point with any authority.

Seventeenth Day. Wednesday, 6th May, 1896.

Witness: VICE-ADMIRAL W. A. KENNEDY, R.N., formerly in command of the East India Station.

SEVERAL Commissioners had examined Vice-Admiral Kennedy upon the question of utilising Indian marine ships, such as the "Lawrence," in time of war. The witness's replies were to the effect that if such vessels were armed they must be under the orders of the Admiralty and not of the Indian Government. In reply to a remark of Mr. Naoroji's (8,473), witness stated that "In a time of war the Admiralty would arm the 'Warren Hastings' and the 'Clive,' they have their guns, and they are very smart ships."

The examination was continued with the object of discovering whether the duties of the squadron on the Indian Station were confined to that Station, or whether it was liable to be summoned to assist, in case of need, a Government, such as the Australian Government. Admiral Kennedy had replied that in case a difficulty arose at Norfolk Island and the Governor of New South Wales wanted a ship to go there, the vessel would be sent immediately, whereupon Mr. NAOROJI asked:—

8,559. But you would have the power of refusing if you chose?—VICE-ADMIRAL KENNEDY: Certainly; it might be impracticable to comply for reasons of a naval character.

8,560. Mr. NAOROJI: That makes all the difference?—VICE-ADMIRAL KENNEDY: Yes.

Later, with reference to the question of the employment of the Indian Squadron in other than Indian waters, Mr. NAOROJI asked:—

8,575. Mr. NAOROJI: Do I understand that the second complaint is that India gets no return?—That seems to be the complaint as far as the remonstrance goes; it was, "India gets no return."

CHAIRMAN:—You must read the words before "occasionally employed."

Mr. NAOROJI: "Vessels not employed in the Persian Gulf are under the command of the Admiralty, and must be occasionally employed on other than Indian services." *See* Treasury so and so "for which India gets no return," and that I understand was the complaint.

CHAIRMAN: But the complaint is that they are occasionally employed on other than Indian services, for which India gets no return.

Mr. NAOROJI: I merely wanted to know what the real complaint was.

The witness was further examined by Mr. NAOROJI:

8,665. Mr. NAOROJI: Does the Royal Navy admit any Indians in employment either as crew or as officers?—No, only as cooks and stewards.

8,666. One or two?—Plenty of them are employed.

8,667. Then that means that India should pay for that from which no Indians derive any benefit of employment?—But they do derive benefit.

8,668. I mean benefit of employment in the Navy. The whole employment must go to the benefit of the Englishmen, according to present arrangements?—No, they have benefit, because there are a great number of Lascars employed in the defence ships, for instance.

8,669. I mean in the Royal Navy, in the Royal Squadron for which India pays this £100,000 and £60,000; I am only talking of the Royal Navy, not the Indian Marine. They get no benefit out of this contribution which they pay for the Royal Squadron?—No, we do not ship natives as seamen in the English Navy because they are not trained for it, and in like manner, I conclude, officers; but Lascars are employed in the Defence Flotilla.

8,670. But is it simply because they are not trained, or is it a determination not to employ them at all? Facilities might be given for them to be trained; is facility given for them to be trained? I know of one instance where an Indian here wanted to be employed—I do not know whether it was exactly as a crew—in one ship, and he was distinctly refused; so, too, in the Army; they are distinctly refused to be employed at all, either in the Royal Navy or the Royal Army?—The natives of India are largely employed in the Army.

8,671. The native Army, but I am talking of the European officers?—Who wanted to join this army?

8,672. We will confine ourselves to the Navy?—Yes. I am not prepared to say whether an Indian gentleman who wished to get his son into the Navy, and who was prepared to send

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

him home to pass his examination—I do not know at all why he should not be admitted; there could be no bias against him. But I am only speaking without authority on the matter.

8,673. That is exactly what I wanted to know. As far as I understand he would be distinctly refused; if any Indian gentleman's son went home he would not be admitted to any training college or any place at all?—Oh, no; try it on. I am sure he would be heartily welcome: there is no feeling of that sort at all.

8,674. His "trying it on" means a deal of expenditure, therefore, can we not have any authoritative expression that, if an Indian came here and wished to enter the college and to be trained just as others (it would be no concession at all) that he would be freely admitted on the same terms as any Englishmen passing the same examination, and so on—Yes.

8,675. Till that order is made, or until that is publicly known, "trying it on" means simply expenditure and going back disappointed?—That could be ascertained quite well. I shall have very great pleasure in finding out for certain, because I cannot answer the question entirely myself.

8,676. I should be very glad if you would find that out?—I will find it out without any delay.

8,667. Assuming that India has an Imperial interest in the Royal Navy, there is so far an equal interest to Britain to maintain its rule also in India?—There is no doubt that Britons do take a great interest in India.

8,678. So far, assuming that the account is balanced with equal interest, is it not right that India should have a proportionate share of the benefits of the employment according to the money India pays? That will be answered if you will kindly find out what I have asked; I need not ask that any further?—Has an Indian man or gentleman ever expressed a desire, because it is rather springing a mine on one; I have never heard that they wanted to come, generally the climate is against it?

8,679. Not necessarily?—They would not like to leave their own home.

8,680. They believe that they would never be admitted?—I see; you start under the belief that there is a great bias against it.

8,681. Both in the Army and in the Navy?—But I do not think so.

8,682. I shall be very glad if you will find that out?—Yes.

8,683. Now it is said that when any expenditure is incurred by the British exchequer, either here or in India, in which both countries are interested, India must contribute a share; on the same principle does not justice require that when any disbursement is made from the Indian exchequer for any purposes in either country in which both countries are interested, the British exchequer should make a fair contribution?—It seems so.

8,684. In apportioning charges between Britain and India should not their respective capacity be taken into consideration? Britain is a vastly rich country, and drawing its riches largely from India, and India is an extremely poor country owing to Britain carrying away its wealth; should not Britain have some consideration for these circumstances?—Of course, these are really questions for experts, and it is the first time I have heard that India is a very poor country, or that it is drained for the benefit of England. I always thought that it was a very rich country and self-supporting, and that without England it would be in rather a bad way.

8,685. We differ very largely in that?—I do not see exactly what you are aiming at. Your contention is that if England had nothing whatever to do with India, India would be better off than she is now?

8,686. That is a different question?—That is what you are thinking of, is it not?

8,687. I say that, comparatively, Britain and India are very different in their capacity for payment or in their wealth. England, taking the expressions of Secretaries of State——?—Has a large swallow.

8,688. England is a very rich country, and India is distinctly poor, as Lord Cromer has stated. Now, I say that in apportioning charges for any purpose which is common to the interests of both, is it not necessary, as the Government of India has also asked, that their comparative capacity to pay must also be taken into consideration, and not merely the arithmetical division?—I expect that if I expressed any opinion upon that subject it would not be worth anything whatever; no one would pay any attention to it. I am not the Chancellor of the Exchequer would tell me to mind my own business.

8,689. That is true, but an English gentleman may express his views, whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer hears him or not?—I think you should put that straight to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but not through me.

8,690. But, if I am supported by good English opinion, I might put it more forcibly to the Chancellor of the Exchequer?—Yes, but you must get an opinion that is worth having, and not mine, upon such subjects as that; it is quite valueless.

8,691. We have got here that they constantly use the words "Indian purposes" and "Indian requirements"?—Yes.

8,692. But is it not the case that there are two parties concerned in all these purposes: the English purpose, namely, the English rule, and the Indian?—Yes.

8,693. Therefore, whatever is supposed to be an entirely independent Indian purpose, as if it were the case of the United States or France, is it not right that in considering all these Indian purposes both these parties should take their fair share in everything that is for the interest of both; that is a question very similar to what I have already put, in fact?—Yes. That is the very reason why India pays this subsidy, because they ought to take their share.

8,694. In the same manner Englishmen ought to take their share for purposes for which India pays?—Of course, we do, because this £100,000 per annum must certainly be a very small proportion of the enormous burdens that England has to bear. And in alluding to Indian purposes, of course they would claim that all our squadrons are really for the benefit of India. We take so much interest and care of India that we keep up large fleets in the Mediterranean and all over the world, on purpose to guard India, which we do not want to lose.

8,695. Which we do not want to lose?—Which we do not want to lose. That is right: if we lost India we should put down a great many of our expenses; therefore all these questions are really Indian purposes, and the whole East Indian squadron is for Indian purposes, because they are looking out to prevent the enemy from coming and attacking India. Without that squadron we might have other people prospecting round the coasts of India and making themselves very disagreeable, no doubt; so that the indirect advantage that India gets from the English navy is enormous. I should say that if they really wanted to claim their just rights, they would be estimated at at least half a million sterling.

8,695*a*. I grant that India has so much benefit out of this squadron, but is not this squadron for the defence of India as much for the interest of England as of India? Is it not for the preservation of British rule, and therefore you pay a portion of the expense, I grant, in this matter?—Yes.

8,696. Well, in other matters there are other purposes also common to both, for which India alone pays, and of which Britain ought to take a share just on the same principle?—Yes. Well, I am not aware of such a case.

8,697. If there are cases, they should be fairly taken into consideration?—Yes, I should conclude so.

8,698. Now, in Question 6,908 we are told: "Then, summing the whole matter together, the cost of the Marine to you is 20 lakhs: there is the £160,000 which is paid as subsidy, which, of course, we must turn into rupees at the rate of exchange; there are the stores for India, £130,000, which we must treat in the same way" (stores, of course, is a material I have nothing to do with). Captain Hext answered, "The Marine budget is 19 lakhs." And then about the pensions he said they are something about 6 lakhs more. Now, considering the squadron expenditure is to be for common purposes, we contribute £160,000?—Yes.

8,699. Then, on the other hand, we spend 20 lakhs in India for the marine and other purposes in which both are interested, because any defence of India, large or small is for the purpose of defending British rule as well as Indian; therefore, should not the British Exchequer take a share in this 20 lakhs, in the same way as we take a share of £160,000 in the Royal Squadron?—I do not know exactly what you would propose, supposing the squadron was withdrawn, to substitute in lieu of this £160,000.

8,700. I do not object to the £160,000 at all, which I say is very properly paid, but I do object on the ground that there are common purposes, and that therefore the Government here supplies this squadron and undergoes certain expenditure, and

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

out of that expenditure not the whole, as I understand, but a portion of it, is paid by India, which comes to £160,000?—Yes.

8,701. Now, I say that the Indians spend 20 lakhs of rupees there for purposes of defence, harbour defence and coast defence, and so on, in which both parties are interested, whether the sum to be divided be large or small?—Yes, but more especially the Indian, I suppose, who pays for his existence.

8,702. Your British rule is far more important to you than it is to the Indians. Would you care a single farthing if British rule were not there, to go and protect India?—You mean that it is not entirely philanthropic?

8,703. Supposing the British rule were not in India, would you care a straw to go and protect India in any way whatever?—I do not suppose that we should go to a great outlay under such circumstances, if the Russians were in possession; but, viewing from the Indian standpoint, they are very much better as they are than under any other circumstances, and therefore pay a very small percentage for protection.

8,704. I accept the Indian point of view as you put it; I want the British point of view to be taken in the same way?—I should say that that is a point I am not prepared to discuss.

8,705. I do not know what the British Empire would be if India were lost; British India is of the highest importance to the British Empire?—No doubt about it.

8,706. Then, with regard to the protection of trade, the question was 6,934—"Nor with the defence of Indian trade"—that is to say, was not the protection for the defence of Indian trade. Then the answer was: "The Indian trade is virtually English trade. It is all carried in English boats and paid for by English money. The Indian trade itself—of India itself—is next to *nil*." Do you agree with that?—No; there is a very large local trade in India, as you know. Perhaps you know Mr. Shepherd, who owns an enormous fleet of ships that never leave Indian waters; there is the Pilgrim line that trades to Mecca, that is all Indian trade; there are companies running up the Persian Gulf which are entirely owned by natives. Of course, the bulk of the trade starts from England, there is no doubt about that, and runs to Bombay; and there is an enormous sailing fleet which comes round the Cape for Calcutta as well. But I suppose that a great deal of the money must remain in India, or in the hands of people of India, and there are a great many wealthy natives who are interested in these ships—largely interested.

8,707. What I want to say is this: the trade that is afloat, exports from India or imports into India from foreign countries—which is, in fact, the bulk of the trade; the coasting trade is very little compared with it, and most of this trade—first of all, the whole shipping—is entirely English interest?—Yes.

8,708. With no share at all of the Indian in it. Then the cargo also, as long as it is floating on the sea, is primarily at the risk of the East India banks and of the English marine insurance offices, because the East India banks, which are, strictly speaking, British interest, supply all the money for the exports or the imports. Therefore, what I mean to say is that while any cargo or any ship is floating on the sea, it is essentially primarily a British interest and British money is concerned in this ship and cargo; and, therefore, I said that Captain Hext was quite right in saying that the Indian trade, strictly speaking, was *nil*, or very little, compared with the whole British risks that are involved in the whole of the foreign trade of India?—Yes. I do not know what he means in saying such a thing; it may be the case.

8,709. What I say is this: that when we are told that the squadron is needed to protect trade, it is forgotten that this trade is mostly British trade, or almost wholly, and very little Indian interest in it?—I suppose these ships pay duties in bringing their cargoes to India, do they not?

8,710. I am talking of the ship and the cargo while it is on the sea, and when the squadron is expected to protect it. While it is on the sea the interest is of British capital almost entirely. Of course, I may take you through the whole process of the transaction in order to explain that to you?—I will take your word for it. Your argument is that the Navy is no good to India at all.

I do not mean to say that it is no good to India at all; we are paying this share, but at the same time I say that the argument which is constantly urged, that the Navy is necessary to protect the Indian trade, the East Indian trade, is a very misleading one; the real interest of the capital that has to be protected is almost wholly British. I wanted to make a correction of your expression "Indian trade."

8,716. Mr. Naoroji: If in former days the British Government imposed any particular taxation, does it mean, therefore, that that is a justification, whether it was right or wrong, for future conduct of the same kind?—I do not know; I am not an exponent of the views of the Government.

Eighteenth Day. Wednesday, 13th May, 1896.

Witness: Mr. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

The witness was examined as to the Irrigation Works of the Government of India. Mr. Naoroji proceeded to question the Witness:—

8,960. Mr. Naoroji: Were some of these irrigation works originally old works upon which only a small amount was expended?—Some of them were old works.

8,961-2. And the capital, that you are including, only is that which is actually expended by you?—That is so.

8,963. Therefore, the interest calculated on that will not be quite fair to revenue as so much interest on the capital?—I believe that it is considered by experts that in most cases the expenditure incurred by Government on such works has been almost as great as if they had been constructed *de novo* by them. There may be some exceptions, but I understand that, as a rule, the existing works have been practically reconstructed.

8,964. What I mean to say is, that the revenue is calculated simply upon actual expenditure?—Yes, simply upon the amount expended by the Government of India.

8,965. All the previous preparations in olden times are used now, and for them no capital is calculated?—That is so, yes.

8,966. Mr. Jackson: Except in so far that you qualify that statement, as I understand, by stating that, in the opinion of the engineers, the cost of reconstruction has been probably as large as it would have been to have constructed the works in the first instance?—Mr. Jacob: Yes, I believe that to be the case.

8,967. Mr. Naoroji: That is in some cases?—Mr. Jacob: In most of the cases, I think, but there may be some exceptions.

8,968. Some of the old canals and irrigation works in the North-west Provinces have been brought into use and reconstructed, I may say, with the same amount of expenditure as if you had built them anew?—I cannot speak on a matter of that kind from any personal knowledge or with any authority, but I have certainly seen a statement to the effect that most of them have been reconstructed at a cost which brings a fair charge against the capital.

8,969. It would be very desirable to know the facts accurately, because I have understood it differently?—I will see if I can obtain any definite information on this point. Some irrigation works, however, certainly were constructed by old Native governments.*

Later.

8,995. Chairman: Are any of the irrigation works in India now worked by companies, or are they all the property of the Government?—They are all now the property of the Government.

8,996. Mr. Naoroji: They were first started by companies, were they not?—The only irrigation companies which carried out works in India were the two which I have already mentioned, the East India Irrigation Company and the Madras Irrigation Company. But Government were constructing irrigation works before they were in the field.

8,997. Those companies did not succeed in making anything out of them, and they sold them to the Government?—Yes.

8,998. Can you give us the figures of the amount paid by Government, and on what principle?—I have already given the figures; they were £1,044,000 for the Orissa works, an £49,000 for the Sone works of the East India Canal, and £1,404,000, plus the writing off of a debt of £358,000, to the Madras Company.

8,999. And what was the market value of those works at the time when the Government bought them over?—That I cannot say.

8,999*a*. It would be worth while knowing what the market value of them was at the time, and what the Government paid for them.

* See Q. 9,645 *et seq.*

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

9,000. Sir RALPH KNOX: They were not yielding any profit at that time?—No.

Sir RALPH KNOX: The market value cannot have been very much.

9,001. Mr. NAOROJI: They were not yielding any profit at that time, but what was the price of the shares in the market?—As I said before, I think, various complications had arisen as to the method of carrying out the works, as to the raising of the further capital required for them, and, in the case of the Orissa Canal, also as to the assessment of the revenue, owing partly to the tardiness of the people in making use of the water and partly to the fact that the irrigation revenue and the land revenue are so much mixed up, that it is very difficult for an independent company to levy its rates separately in any way which would be considered fair by the Government.

Later.

9,018. Mr. NAOROJI: Is it true that by the action of some of these irrigation works a large extent of land has become sterile and cannot be cultivated any more under what is called Rhea, I think?—I believe that that has been the case in some parts of the country.

9,019. Can you give us some information about it, as to what extent that effect has been produced, and which canals have produced it?—No, I have not got that information.

9,020. Is it only one canal, or is it more than one?—I really have no accurate information on the point, but I believe it is only in one case that any great inconvenience has resulted.

9,021. It would be better to know that accurately, because there are some strong impresions about it?—I will inquire.

Nineteenth Day. Tuesday, 19th May, 1896.

Witness: CAPTAIN HEXT, R.N.

9,516. Mr. NAOROJI: Now, it is generally stated that the Imperial conditions have very much changed, and that, therefore, all the interests of the British Empire having increased, the Indian Empire must contribute to all those increased interests. Now, would Britain hold that all the interests that have arisen from change of time and circumstances have not arisen from the interests of Britain herself; that is to say, her rule in the Indian Empire and her position in Europe and her own condition?—I am afraid I am not a polician; I can give no answer to a question of that sort.

9,517. We are often told about the common interests of the Empire in which India is interested, but where India and England both are interested, is it not proper that England should take a share instead of putting the whole burden upon India?—I should say most assuredly.

9,518. In all the common interests, yes. This is a question based upon the award, and the award is before us, so I will put the question now. Is not the whole award based one-sidedly on the fallacious assumption that India is an independent country, master of itself, of its own resources, and having her own benefits at her own command, instead of being kept down in helpless subjection by Britain, and Britain having most vital interests of her own at stake, as well?—I do not quite follow you.

9,519. I am taking the whole award. Is not the whole award based on a one-sided fallacious assumption, namely, that India is an independent country, master of itself, of its own resources, and having her own benefits at her own command, when in reality she is kept down in helpless subjection to Britain, Britain having most vital interests of her own at stake, and Britain having the whole power to do what it likes with the resources of India? The fallacy lies in this, that India is considered as if it were negotiating independently on her own strength with an equal power. That is the whole drift of the whole award, and therefore she is made to pay the whole cost of the armament and of the naval supply with which we are now dealing?—If you ask me if I think the award a strictly fair one to India, I should say no.

9,520. If India is asked to take a share in all Imperial burdens, is it not right and just, therefore, also that India should have all Imperial rights in all the services, Army, Navy, Civil, of the Empire, because she is often told that she is a part of the Empire and she must contribute to the defence, and the words there are "general defence of the Empire"?—I think that is a question I can hardly answer. As I said before, I am not a politician, and I do not study these questions.

9,521. Then the same remark I may apply to the Conference, whose decision has been constantly appealed to in the whole controversy, that the Conference has gone entirely on the assumption that India was, as it were, an independent power to negotiate with, and that India therefore has certain responsibilities as one who has its own resources at its own command. If that is not accepted, if that is not correct, then the whole decision of the Conference goes for nothing?—There were members of the Conference representing the Government of India, though no one was actually sent from India in the same way as from Australia.

9,522. But then the Government of India, or the Secretary of State for India, are a department of the British rule, and they do not represent, as Mr. Gladstone himself admitted, the interest of the Indians, as an independent Indian nation altogether; it is all subservient to the British rule and British power and British interests?—They are governed by England.

9,523. Without any voice in the disposal of its resources?—Except that the Government of India watch the interests of India as closely as possible in every possible way.

9,524. Yes, all the departments that have been discussing this question have been all acting upon that principle of getting what they can out of India, but they have never recognised the principle that whatever is done in India for the interests of both—that is to say, both for the British rule and for India itself—that the British exchequer also should contribute. That point has not been touched upon by any one of the controversialists; can that be fair?—I have never sat on any board of the sort; therefore I cannot give an opinion.

9,525. I am only talking about the correspondence as it is here. This correspondence does not show in the slightest degree that either the Government of India or the other parties have taken that view of it. Well, then, it is said here that India has to pay the whole cost, effective and non-effective, of this armament. Now, is not this the same one-sidedness upon which the whole of this controversy is carried on, ignoring all along the interest which Britain also has, even more vitally than India, in all the interests for which those services are required, small or large?—I do not think I am capable of giving any opinion except on the matters which have already been placed before the Commission where I have endeavoured to show the Indian point of view.

9,526. From the Government of India point of view, not the Indian's point of view?—Yes, and also the interests of the people of India.

9,527. Yes, but the interests of the people of India have had no expression whatever, either in the Conference or on the representation for the award or in any way whatever, so you can hardly know what the interests of the people of India were. I am talking more of the Government of India in that respect. Then, in a Treasury letter to the India Office, these words occur, "securing to India an effective voice in its control." "The principle that India ought to pay for the whole cost of the squadron was admitted at the Conference, with the proviso that its composition was to be revised, and that arrangements were to be made for securing to India an effective voice in its control." Now, is not this expression and the whole reasoning in fact utterly misleading—"securing to India an effective voice in its control"; is it not simply the voice of the British by means of its own agents, servants, and departments? There is no voice of India itself in the matter at all, while the British public understands it to be the voice of India, when it is very well known that the whole resources of India are entirely at the disposal of the British authorities, and to say that the Government of India echoes the voice of India is what Mr. Gladstone has called a paradox. Now, with regard to comparisons made with Australia; constant comparisons are made, and arguments are based upon them; but should not this be borne in mind, that Australia is its own master; whatever she does is within her own power, will, and voice; she can do whatever she considers for her own interest. Also an Australian has access to every and any service of the empire. Well, have the Indians any such power, will or voice? Has India any command of her own resources? are they not entirely at the mercy of the British, to be disposed of at their own sweet will, and, as far as possible, to their own interests? and the Indians also have no access to all the Imperial services of the empire. Now, is not this fact a contrast between the two

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized by Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

mind and to act according to her own interest, the case would be quite analogous and right; but as it is at present, to treat India as Australia for British purposes, and then to treat India as it is actually treated for Indian purposes, is it not altogether unfair? Then the words "Indian purposes are constantly used here, on which the Conference and the award are based, but what does this "Indian purposes" mean? does it mean that in all those purposes Britain has no share whatever in its own interest? should it not be called "British and Indian purposes," and instead of putting the whole cost of the squadron upon India alone, should it be divided between the two in some fair ratio, according to the capacities of each and according to the interests of each? The word "Indian purposes" is entirely misleading?—The word "Indian purposes" has been the rock upon which the whole controversy has set in.

9,528. And it is wrongly interpreted all along, and upon that fallacy is the whole award and the whole conference based. Now, taking the passed instances of the East India Company spending a certain amount of money, the contention that we ought therefore to be prepared to spend the same amount of money now. I will just take one instance in the last century—the British Administration was the most oppressive and the most plundering that has ever existed in the world (those are the words of the report of the Directors, not mine). Now, would the present Royal Lady Empress follow such an example? Certainly not. Then in the same way, supposing the East India Company of their own free will and of their despotic power, which they possessed, had done certain injustice to India before in compelling her to find everything for their own interest; would it be right for the Victorian rule to follow the same precedent and say to us that, as we spent so much before, we must spend the same amount now?—I think the whole of my evidence before the Commission goes to show that I wish to see fair play between both; I hope so.

9,529. I do not know whether it is said in the award, or not, that the arrangements made in 1861-62 were not binding on the British Government; however, on the same ground shall I say that, referring or appealing to past evidence, whether right or wrong, just or unjust, in order to strengthen the position which the Admiralty takes up here, is not fair. Well now, with regard to Australia again. Here are a few words, which I will just quote, which explain the whole position. Mode of calculating the cost, paragraph 3, page 53: "Under the agreement arrived at in March, 1890, the charge against India is to take the form of the whole cost, effective and non-effective, of certain ships. My Lords remark that the maximum calculation by the Admiralty of this cost seems very moderate." These sentences need not be quoted; what I want is the following part. "To compare it with the charge made to the Australasian colonies for the increase of the Australian squadron is irrelevant, because that charge does not pretend to represent the whole cost of the ships, but is what the Australian colonies were willing to pay and Parliament thought it expedient to accept." Now is not that a comment upon the position of Australia and India, that from Australia the Government here can only get what they will give, and from India they may take whatever they like. They cannot make Australia pay whatever they like. Well, I think I will stop here.

The examination was continued by other Commissioners. Mention was made of the protection afforded by the Navy to Indian and British trade.

9,542. Mr. NAOROJI: But while this trade which we are now considering is under protection, is it not entirely the British interest of the East India banks and the insurance offices—the whole cargo is entirely a British interest while it is floating and while it is under this protection?—CAPTAIN HEXT: I think that is going a little too far, there is no doubt India has an interest in the cargo if they have sold it; otherwise it would not produce it.

9,543. That is true, but that is not the question. The question is, while under this protection, is it British interest or Indian interest, that is the question; while under this protection it is entirely British interest.

CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Naoroji, you see there is a difference of opinion; I should say exactly the contrary.

Mr. NAOROJI: I only say what my opinion is, as a matter of fact.

CHAIRMAN: It is entirely in the interest of India that it comes over here. India is interested in selling her corn and cotton, which add immensely to her wealth; and as much as any country in the world she is interested in her foreign trade.

Mr. NAOROJI: I will admit all that, but the question is simply this, that with regard to this protection of trade, at the time this protection is given to the trade, it is entirely British. It is with that point that we have to deal.

As to the apportionment of the charges of the expenditure on the Navy between Great Britain and India, Mr. NAOROJI asked:

9,606. With regard to dividing, should not the amount be divided, because all those interests are not merely Indian interests, but joint British and Indian interests?—I think, whenever they were joint interests, that the cost should be borne by both sides.

9,607. Then, if we are asked to take a share in the expenditure for the protection of trade, must we not then have a fair and full share in the service which protects, and to which we are asked to contribute?—I do not quite follow you.

9,608. The navy is to protect the trade, as it is said?—Yes.

9,609. And we are asked to contribute to that protection; then should we not have a share in the service itself, which is to protect, that is, in the Navy?—A share in what.

9,610. In the employment in the service as officers, as crew, in every way, fully; if we are asked to contribute we ought to have a share of the profits, also of its employment?—The natives of India, as a rule, are not at all suited to a sea life.

9,611. That is not the question; supposing that they want, is it open to them—should it not be open to them, they must have a fair share?—If they were thoroughly efficient there is no doubt they would have, yes.

9,612. That is just the thing that they are not at present. Very well, then is not everything that is important to India as important to Britain, just as long as it has its own rule and power in its great Empire of India?—I should say the interests of the one were bound up in the interests of the other.

9,613. Indissolubly bound up, as Lord Roberts said?—Quite right.

Twentieth Day. Wednesday, 3rd June, 1896.

Witness: MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

Asked by the Chairman, with regard to a question put by Mr. Naoroji on a previous occasion as to the total loss incurred on the railway revenue account from the first construction of railways in India to the present time, the witness put in tables for a period of 38 years (from 1858); whereupon Mr. NAOROJI asked:

9,640. Did not the Great Indian Peninsular commence in 1853-54, between Bombay and Tana, I think?—Mr. JACOB: I believe portions of the guaranteed railways were open before this account begins; but no charge to the Railway Revenue account was made before that.

9,641. CHAIRMAN: That was 1858?—Yes, 1857-58. There must have been charges for interest before that. And as soon as any portions of the lines were opened, there must have been traffic receipts and charges. Even in this account there was a net expenditure for the first two years without any revenue at all.

9,642. Mr. NAOROJI: Then the charge before 1858 is not included in this?—Mr. JACOB: it is not included in this statement.

9,643. Mr. NAOROJI: I think that those earlier years might be added as well, in order to show the full extent that has been drawn from the revenue?—Mr. JACOB: I will see if I can find any information about that.

9,644. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps it would be better if you made it clear on the head of the account that it begins with 1858?—Mr. JACOB: Yes.

The witness made a statement with reference to the dealings of the Government of India with the East India Irrigation Company, after which Mr. NAOROJI asked:

9,654. Could you tell us what the market price of those

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

shares was at the time this money was paid over?—No, I do not know what the market price of the East India Irrigation Company's shares was.

9,655. Did I understand you rightly that the Government, when this company was started, was in no way responsible, that they did not guarantee them in any way whatever, that the Government was entirely free, and that it was entirely on account of the company itself that the scheme was started and carried out?—I do not think it could be said that the Government had no responsibility whatever, but it did not guarantee any interest on the capital.

9,656. They did not guarantee the interest on the capital?—No.

9,657. They did not guarantee the payment of capital at any time, nor guarantee to pay a certain interest to the shareholders at any time?—No, there was no guarantee, but the Company entered into a contract with the Government regarding the construction of the canal, and Government provided them with land and gave them various kinds of assistance.

9,658. Government gave them some assistance, but Government was not in any way bound to recoup them for any expenses they might incur, either interest or capital, as I understand it?—No, there was no guarantee.

Later, Mr. NAOROJI asked, with reference to the canals of the East India Irrigation Company:—

9,667. Has it ever happened that during the drought the canals themselves wanted water and were not of much use?—I am afraid I cannot give any evidence about that.

The witness was asked by Sir RALPH KNOX if any of the expenditure incurred upon the Orissa Canal Works had been charged against the Famine Insurance Fund, and the reply was, "I do not think so."

Mr. NAOROJI thereupon remarked:—

9,686. There is a column at page 11 of Sir H. Waterfield's paper, Table 5, Construction of protective irrigation works, under the heading, "Increase or Decrease of Expenditure on Imperial Account in India on Famine Relief and Insurance." This would show that there is some expenditure incurred from the Famine Relief Fund on account of irrigation?—Yes, there is some expenditure, but not on account of these works.

9,687. I understood you to say no?—No. I think Sir Ralph's question was whether there was any expenditure on these particular works which had been charged to the Famine Relief Fund.

9,688. Sir RALPH KNOX: Yes.

The witness was examined by the Chairman upon the expenditure of the Education Department of the Government of India. Asked if the figures presented included the whole of the expenditure on education, the witness replied in the negative, stating that there was also expenditure from municipal funds, which was not charged in Government accounts. "Local" rates were also mentioned as contributing towards Education.

9,911. Mr. NAOROJI: Local rates and municipal rates are different from each other?—Yes.

9,912. Local rates are levied by the Government?—Yes.

9,913. CHAIRMAN: But they would not be included in this budget?—Mr. JACOB: The local rates, as distinguished from municipal rates, are. The local rates are not included under the head of Education, but the Education charges against them are.

9,914. CHAIRMAN: Would this Rx.1,469,000 include any expenditure upon village schools as apart from municipal schools?—Mr JACOB: Yes.

9,915. Mr. NAOROJI: But they are not included in the receipts which are locally raised?—Mr. JACOB: They are not included in Education receipts; they come under Provincial Rates.

9,916. Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, and are not included in the education receipts?—Mr. JACOB: No.

Later.

9,963. Mr. NAOROJI: Can you give something like the whole of the Government expenditure, including those provincial rates, on education of every sort, on every grade of education, per head of population. I am talking only of the charge, the whole Government charge, including grants in aid and grants to the universities and the higher schools and technical schools of every kind?—I have not got it worked out.

9,964. Will you be able to give the total per head?—In each province?

9,965. In the whole of India, taking the whole educational expenditure?—The rate per head of the educational expenditure of India?

9,966. Yes; the rate per head of the educational expenditure of India in every form disbursed by Government, including grants in aid?—I will endeavour to put in a statement.

9,967. CHAIRMAN; That is to say, you mean the Rx. 1,470,000 which is put in the Budget, and the Rx. 235,000 which is not in the Budget?

9,968. Mr. NAOROJI: The latter is the municipal expenditure; I am not including that. I mean what is disbursed by Government, from the Government taxes, per head of population, and also a similar expenditure in this country by Government from taxes, so as to make a comparison between the two countries.

Again, Mr. Naoroji asked

9,983. The whole expenditure on education is very small compared with the whole population?—Yes that is so.

9,984. It requires very much enlarging, if possible, and I think Government would be only too glad to spend more money if they had it?—I think Government would very much like to see the people take up education themselves, and not depend so much upon the expenditure of Government money.

9,985. But if the people are so poor in British India, it is impossible either for the people or the Government to spend much on education, especially when a great deal is spent on warlike operations and in other ways?—No doubt the poverty of the people affects the amount which they can spend on education.

* * * * * *

9,990. Mr. NAOROJI: You can give the general proportion of the grants in aid to the whole of the Government expenditure—Government expenditure is not all grant in aid?—No; Government expenditure is not all grant in aid.

9,991. Then what is grant in aid out of the whole Government expenditure, you can give that?—I have given that already.

9,992. Mr. MOWBRAY: Are any grants made to educational establishments not in British territory?—They may be made in a few cases where there are political establishments, but they would be quite exceptional cases.

9,993. Mr. NAOROJI: Do you think there are any cases?—I think there are, but I think that probably the charge is in such cases covered by local receipts.

9,994. Outside of British territory?—Yes.

As regards the pay of Army chaplains, it was remarked that the civil community was a well-to-do body who could well afford to pay for their own religious ministers, but it was suggested that they were a shifting body of people, always changing and that from such a body it would be difficult to provide a minister's stipend. Mr. NAOROJI remarked:

10,047. In the Presidency towns, the population is not very shifting—Yes, I should say it was shifting there too.

10,048. The European population—the civil population?—Yes; I should say the civil were too.

10,049. So far as the the principle of attaching chaplains to troops alone was concerned, it would not matter whether the Presidency towns had a chaplain or not for the purposes of civilians?—Presidency towns could support their own chaplains, I suppose.

It being suggested that the public Treasury in India made larger payments for endowment for Hindu and Muhammadan religious purposes than for the English clergy, the witness replied that

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

beyond remission of land revenue, there was no direct payment for such purposes.

10,060. Mr. NAOROJI: At the same time, these endowments originally existed; they have only passed over into the hands of Government, have they not?—They are merely the continuation of endowments which existed under former Governments.

10,061. CHAIRMAN: And they are charged on gross revenues, are they?—I think they are granted chiefly in the form of remissions of revenue.

The accounts of the Medical Department were next examined.

Mr. Naoroji asked:

10,102. The expenditure on educational medical establishments, such as colleges, is included in the educational amount, is it not?—No, it is included under Medical.

10,103. And medical colleges are not included in the educational grant of Rx. 1,400,000?—The charges for medical schools and colleges come under the head of Medical, not under the head of Education.

10,104. Are they not included under the total of Education?—No.

Twenty-first Day. Wednesday, 10th June, 1896.

Witness: MR. STEPHEN JACOB.

During the examination on the subject of civil furlough and absentee allowances:

10,275. CHAIRMAN: The rules for Indian native civil servants are rather more restricted, are they not, than those of Europeans? In the matter of furlough the rule appears to be as follows: "On private affairs leave may, as in the case of other covenanted civil servants, be granted for six months at a time after intervals of six years, but not in any case until six years' service has been rendered." I understand that to be the same for the European and the native. "Furlough not exceeding two years in all may be taken in periods not exceeding one year at a time, the first after ten and thereafter at intervals of at least eight years; but if none is taken for 18 years, two years' furlough may be granted at once"?—Yes, those are the rules for officers who have entered the Civil Service, not by passing the examination in this country in the same way as Europeans do, but simply by nomination.

10,276-7. Mr. NAOROJI: For this furlough there is a certain amount to be paid on the ground of compensation for exchange, is there not?—The rate of conversion is fixed at a special rate of 1s. 6d.

10,278. And that is fixed on account of the fall in exchange?—Yes, that is so.

10,279. The Government of India is not bound legally to make any such allowance on account of exchange?—The special rate of exchange was conceded as part of the proceedings in connexion with the grant of exchange compensation allowance.

10,280. Yes, but it was not that the Government was bound legally to make any allowance for compensation?—No, certainly there was no legal obligation.

Upon the question of superannuation, it was stated that while a member of the Civil Service was compulsorily retired after thirty-five years' service, he might retire after twenty-five years' service with the same pension that was granted for the longer period. SIR JAMES PEILE remarked:—

10,329. They do not retire so early now as they used to do?—No.

10,330. Mr. NAOROJI: I understand that lately there has been a good deal more retirement after twenty-five year's service than there used to be before?—I should not have said so.

10,330A. If they retire after twenty-five years' service they get £1,000 a year pension, and they only get £1,000 after any longer period of service?—Yes.

Later, upon the subject of the salaries of English and Anglo-Indian civilians, Mr. NAOROJI remarked that the salary paid in India was proportionally higher than in England. After further examination, Mr. NAOROJI put these questions.

10,490. Mr. NAOROJI: In the return of East Indian salaries, there are two items in connexion with the pension about which I want a little explanation. The return is made in 1892. There is one item, "retired pay and pensions," £1,897,385 paid in England, and the other item is mentioned in this way: "pensions towards which officers have contributed," and that is a separate item of £1,154,534. Am I to understand that in the first item where it is simply said "retired pay and pensions," there is no contribution from the officers?—I should suppose that is the case. I have not got the return before me now. I should suppose that the first figure represents pensions which have not been subscribed to.

10,491. Then that is the explanation of these two items described in different ways?—Yes; that is probably the distinction between them.

10,492. So that they are of two distinct characters?—I should suppose so.

10,493. One includes contribution, and the other does not include any contribution?—Yes.

In reply to a question Mr. Jacob presented a statement showing the charges against Famine Relief Insurance. Mr. NAOROJI observed:

10,645. You said in some years the charge was not provided?—Yes. I should have said only very small amounts were provided.

10,646. But in those years the revenue was collected that was intended to provide that charge, was it not?—No revenue was remitted during those years.

10,647. No revenue was remitted? The revenue was collected, though the provision was not made?—I do not think it can be said that any particular revenue is assigned to this.

10,648. No, but there was no less revenue collected on account of that grant being withheld?—No.

10,649. Sir JAMES PEILE: But the Famine Grant is in fact merely a surplus of revenue assigned to this purpose when there is a surplus?—Yes.

10,650. Sir JAMES PEILE: If there is no surplus you cannot assign it?—No, not without extra taxation.

Towards the close of the day's examination of Mr. Jacobs, Mr. NAOROJI reverted to the subject of educational grants.

10,718. Mr. NAOROJI: With regard to the educational institutions, in former days, when the Indians were not sufficiently educated, it was only natural that professors, teachers, and inspectors should be Englishmen; but now, when the colleges and the universities have been turning out Indians of very great attainments, if Indians instead of Englishmen were employed in the Education Department (excepting perhaps for one or two purposes, such as English language and literature, or some such important subject in which an Englishman would be the best teacher), would not that diminish very much the expenditure of the Education Department?—Yes; but I believe that the employment of natives in the Education Department has been very largely extended.

10,719. And if it is extended further it will tend towards economical expenditure?—The employment of natives undoubtedly would diminish the expenditure, but I am not sure that I can say it would be more economical.

10,720. I mean that you have men of equal ability and knowledge among the Indians who could be employed at a lower salary?—I do not know that I could say of equal ability and knowledge.

10,721. I am taking it that the Indian Universities have done their work, and produced many men of great attainments and quite as able as any other set of men; otherwise the Universities are doing no work?—Undoubtedly the Indian Colleges have turned out many scholars who have proved themselves at the University examinations to be men of great attainments. And I believe several of these men have been employed, and are employed, by the Education Department.

10,722. If that employment were extended more and more, it would be more economical?—Doubtless; and I should suppose it will be more extended as greater numbers qualify themselves for such employment.

10,723. At less salaries. Certainly there is a large number

CC0. Prof. Hargopal Collection, Haldwani

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

of educated youths sent out from the universities from whom a sufficient number can be obtained who could be perfectly qualified to do those duties?—The Education Department is not a very favourite Department. I think that natives of India of great attainments, as a rule, prefer employment in other Departments.

10,724. Yes, but I am talking of the Education Department like all other Departments, wherever a native can be found qualified to fill a certain post, will it not be economical to employ him instead of necessarily putting in the European? That is the question. It is only natural?—I should say so, where a native can be employed with due regard to efficiency.

10,725. Wherever he can he employed?—He can be engaged at a lower salary.

10,726. Yes, he can be engaged at a lower salary; two-thirds is the proportion laid down by the Secretary of State?—The difficulty is to get a sufficient number of qualified natives.

10,727. The difficulty, in fact, arises because they are not allowed to enter, not that there is any difficulty in getting them. The difficulty is that Government will not employ them. If the Government laid down regular rules and regulations, according to which these appointments were to be given by certain proper competition and a fair trial, then we should know whether there were qualified persons or not?—I should say that, the employment of natives being cheaper, the Provincial Governments would employ them, wherever they considered that that could be done consistently with efficiency and good administration.

10,728. Is any system adopted by which properly qualified natives can be employed as a matter of right? Is there any system adopted by which anybody may compete and get a proper place? There is no such system; there is no fair trial given?—There is no general system of competition for the higher appointments in the Education Department, either for Europeans or natives.

10,729. If this can be done, and if the Indian element can be introduced and made larger and larger, the expenditure will be more economical, being at a less salary?—Yes, as far as it is possible to do so consistently with efficiency and good administration.

10,730. And there is this advantage, that it would be an economical advantage to India that so many of the Indians would be provided for, instead of persons coming in and supplying their places? There would be the double advantage; not only the actual amount of saving on the expenditure, but the actual economical effect upon the country itself. Well, the same questions will apply, I say, to the Public Works Department. From the engineering colleges engineers are prepared in large numbers, and yet India employs them very sparingly, and does not give sufficient encouragement to them to come out and do the work of their country. If a sufficient number of engineers were employed from the Indians, then, on the same ground, there would be economising of expenditure, would there not?—I do not think so at present. The Provincial Service system is being gradually extended to the Public Works Department. But, as far as I know, no large number of natives in that Department are as yet paid at a lower rate than the Europeans.

10,731. But they could be obtained if there was a regular system of employing Indians, and they were allowed to rise in the service. We know that natives of the same acquirements and knowledge can be obtained at a less salary, which would be only reasonable, and the Secretary of State insists that they should be paid at two-thirds the salary?—I do not know whether that is possible at present to any great extent in the case of the engineers.

10,732. If they are fairly employed, and if a fair opening is given to them, they cannot ask as high salaries as are given to Europeans coming from a distance?—Many of those employed hitherto have received the same salaries as Europeans.

10,733. That may be because there are only very few employed, and Government cannot make a distinction; but if there is a regular system of employment, the best they can get at such salaries as the natives are willing to accept, the natives will accept them with very great pleasure?—The matter has been under consideration, and the extension of the Provincial Service system to the Public Works Department has been sanctioned, but I do not think it has been brought into force so far, to any great extent.

Twenty-second Day. Wednesday, 17th June, 1896.

Witness: MR. STEPHEN JACOB, C.S.I.

The witness was examined upon the collection of land revenue. In the course of the proceedings the witness informed the Commission that there had been a decrease in the number of Europeans employed in the Land Revenue Department. The Chairman expressed the opinion that the Commission ought to have the details of what posts had been transferred from Europeans to Indians, because a general impression existed that Europeans were employed wherever possible. The witness stated that the Secretary of State refused to prepare such a statement; the only objection being, so far as he knew, the great labour it would involve.

10,976. Sir RALPH KNOX: What period does the Parliamentary Return cover?—The Parliamentary Return comes up to quite a recent year.

10,977. Mr. NAOROJI: The one of 1892 you mean?—Yes.

10,978. That gives only the total, and you cannot make any comparison between this 1892 and the previous year?—No.

10,979. I should be very glad if I could get a similar return for 1875-6.

. . . . . .

10,983. Mr. NAOROJI: This is the Parliamentary Return of 1892 to which you have referred, I think, in which Europeans, Eurasians and natives are separated (exhibiting return)?—Yes.

10,984. And their salaries are given, begining with 1,000 rupees and upwards; but this is for 1892. If we want a comparison with the other year with which we are making all these comparisons, we ought to have a similar return for that year; and, until that is done we can hardly make any comparison?—There was an earlier return, I think, and the two returns will give you a pretty fair idea.

10,985. There was an earlier return in 1878, but it was never printed, it was never published.

10,986. Sir RALPH KNOX: It exists?—Yes, it exists.

Mr. NAOROJI: Can we get it?

10,987. CHAIRMAN: Will you ascertain?—Yes, I will.

10,988. Mr. NAOROJI: If we get the 1878 return published with this 1892 return we can form some accurate idea of what the comparative employment of Europeans is. As to the excess of natives that is only natural. You have the whole of the inferior subordinate service to be performed by natives, and to quote the number of natives as compared with Europeans is certainly unfair. It is the higher posts only, where the Europeans are employed, that ought to be compared to see how many Europeans are employed and how many natives or Indians. It is no use saying there is a large Indian service; there must be a large Indian service. I do not see the use of going down to clerks, and all that, and saying there is a very large number of natives; but limit it to posts in which the salary is, say, £1,000. If we get the return of 1878, made on Mr. Bright's requisition, printed, we can compare that with this, or abstract it to the same extent as this. It is a very large return, because it is going into every detail, as I understand it?—Yes, it goes into great detail.

10,989. But then if a small abstract like this be made that would be enough for our purpose?—Yes, I will see if I can give that.

10,996. Mr. NAOROJI: Then with regard to the services that were set aside for the Indians in 1880, is not that increment altogether nullified by the Secretary of state having cancelled the statutory service altogether. Is not that really cancelled altogether, though the Act of 1870 still exists?—The provincial service system has taken the place of that system.

10,997. Then that is cancelled, is it not?—Appointments are not made now under the rules of 1880.

10,998. In substituting the provincial service, are not actually the number of appointments lessened than what the Indians would have got under the Act of 1870?—I do not think so.

10,999. Well, I should like it if you could ascertain. Then, again, under the Act of 1870 these appointments were

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

as part and parcel of the Indian Civil Service; these provincal appointments are not, and it is a lower grade of service, is it not?—They are paid about the same rate as the men were paid who were appointed under the Act of 1870

11,000-1. Yes, but they cannot go any further; whereas by the Act of 1870 the whole civil service was open to those who were appointed under that Act. By the rules of the provincial civil service they are restricted only to a certain number of subordinate situations, and they cannot go any further?—I have not referred to the orders about the provincial civil service very lately; I should like to refresh my memory before making any statement about it, but my impression is that the pay that they receive is just as high under the provincial civil service system as that which was given to the statutory civil service.

11,002. Yes, that is true. But then the number is reduced as well as the prospects. They are limited to a certain grade only, while under the Act of 1870 they could have risen to any post like other civil servants?—Yes. I am not aware of how far that is the case.

11,003. Sir JAMES PEILE: Provided only that they were fit for such posts, I think?—Certainly.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, of course; but then they are now deprived altogether, whether they are fit or not.

Sir JAMES PEILE: Not at all.

Mr. NAOROJI: You have cancelled the whole thing.

Sir JAMES PEILE: I do not admit that for a moment.

Witness was next examined as to the revenue derived from the salt tax. It was admitted that from 1895-6 there had been a slight increase in the tax, the present duty on import being stated as 2 rupees 8 annas per maund of 82 lbs.

11,098-9. Sir JAMES PEILE: Not on the duty on *import*, the excise?—Mr. JACOB: It is the same, 2 rupees 8 annas per maund.

11,100. Mr. NAOROJI: Is that customs duty or excise duty, 2 rupees 8 annas per maund?—Mr. JACOB: Both.

11,101. Mr. NAORJI: That is since 1887-88?—Mr. JACOB: In January, 1888, the general rate was fixed at 2 rupees 8 annas.

Later, upon the revenue derived from income tax, Mr. NAOROJI asked:

11,232-33. The income-tax, as I understand, is six pies in the rupee?—Five pies in the rupee on incomes above 2,000 rupees.

11,234. And under 2,000 rupees to 500?—4 pies.

11,235. It is diminished?—Yes.

11,236. How much is 5 pies in the rupee?—About 6¼d. in the £.

Twenty-fourth Day. Wednesday, 24th June, 1896.

Witness: SIR HENRY WATERFIELD, K.C.S.I., C.B.,

The Witness was examined upon the expenditure of the Secretary of State in England. In the course of the proceedings Mr. NAOROJI asked:

11,939. I have got a statement given to me of a comparison between some articles as supplied by the Secretary of State for India and as supplied to the Rangoon municipality, and these prices are given in these two documents. With regard to these articles there is a large per-centage of excess shown to be for the articles supplied by the Secretary of State for India. I would give you both these papers and the statement, and perhaps you will be able to tell us some time what you think of that statement with regard to the excess of charge here, compared with that made to the municipality of Rangoon?—I will see whether we are able to give an explanation.

The salaries of the officials at the India Office came under review, and Mr. NAOROJI proceeded to examine Sir H. WATERFIELD as follows:

12,023. Mr. NAOROJI: There are no Indians in the India Council nor in the India Office establishment, nor in any of the services here for which the India Office pays?—There are none in the India Council, and there are no pure natives of India on the India Office establishment.

12,024. The whole benefit of salary and employment remains with the British people, although money is provided by the Indian taxpayer?—Yes, if you consider that we give no benefit to the people of India by our services.

12,025. In this country the revenue raised from the people returns to the same people; that is, the British people get all the salaries and employment in England: whereas a portion of the Indian revenue does not return to the Indian taxpayer, but to a foreign people, that is, to the British, that is a mere matter of fact also?—Yes.

12,026. Is not the expenditure of the India Office for the interests of the maintenance of British rule as well as for the interests of India; in fact, the interests of both countries are concerned in the expenses of the India Office?—The interests of both countries are concerned.

12,027. When any money is spent from the British Exchequer either in this country or in India for any purpose in which both countries are interested, India is asked to contribute a share; should not in justice the same principle apply that when any money is spent from the Indian Exchequer for any purpose in which both countries are interested, Britain should also contribute its proper share?—That is a matter of opinion, of course, in any particular case, how far that may apply.

12,028. I merely ask your opinion whether it is right or not that it should be so. We are asked to contribute to certain disbursements made by the British Exchequer, because, it is said, they are for the common interest of both countries; in the same manner, if the Indian Exchequer disburses any money which is also for the common interest of both countries, should not the British Exchequer contribute, just as we are asked to contribute?—I think that the question of apportionment of charge must be considered in each case. I am not prepared to say that the payment for the India Office should necessarily be shared.

12,029. I am putting it as a general question, whether it would be just or not that the British Exchequer should contribute in the same way and on the same principle as the Indian Exchequer is asked to contribute, for any disbursements made by the British Exchequer?—The British Exchequer undoubtedly must contribute to the expenses of the Empire. I cannot say how the apportionment, in any particular case, should be arranged.

12,030. I am not giving you any particular case, I only want the principle, that both should be treated on the same principle?—As I say, I think that the expenses of the whole Empire must be apportioned in certain degrees.

12,031. Should not any expenses in which both countries are interested be apportioned?—Not necessarily. In each case it must be considered whether the particular expense is a proper one for apportionment or not.

12,032. Yes, but if the expenses are for the benefit of both countries for common purposes, just as the reference to this Commission assumes?—Yes, I am not able to assent to it in this particular case.

12,033. I am talking of expenditure for the benefit of both countries; then the contribution must come from both. In certain cases where there is a benefit for both countries India must contribute; while in other cases where the benefit is also to both countries the British should not contribute at all. That would not be just?—I think, as you were putting it to me, you asked whether a rule which applies to some particular cases should not be applied to all cases. I say that I am not prepared to assent to that.

12,034. I am not asking for any particular cases, I am asking it generally; any case in which both countries are interested then both must contribute to it; it is a simple question?—Well, I do not agree that necessarily it must be so.

13,035. With regard to the Engineering College, can you give us any idea of the amount of money disbursed from the Indian revenues up to this time for its maintenance, for its establishment, and also whether there is any chance of that money being reimbursed by the students that come in generally for other purposes or for their own purposes?—It is not likely that past expenditure will be reimbursed.

12,036. No; so all that is gone?—But, as I explained to the Chairman, efforts have been made to put it now upon a self-supporting footing, and it is very nearly accomplished. I think there is still some charge each year.

12,037. The past expenditure, therefore, is beyond recovery?—I think so.

12,038. Though it is useful to the British youths here, and has been from the very beginning?—If your question refer

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

the students who come in, not going to India, they do fully pay their cost I think. I think there is no doubt that they do. I do not think there is any charge on the revenues of India through that; it is rather the other way.

Twenty-seventh day. Wednesday, 15th July, 1896.

Witness: Sir RALPH KNOX, K.C.B., a Member of Royal Commission.

With regard to the army charges of the Home Government, the witness, in the course of examination, stated that a respectable force was kept in course of training in England to meet the demands of the Indian Government; and that, but for the purpose of meeting those demands, the force would not be wanted by the English Government. Mr. NAOROJI remarked:

12,601. You say you do not want them; is it not for the maintenance of the British rule that it is absolutely necessary for you to have a European force in India, according to the declarations of the Government itself; but for that the Indian army would be quite enough to meet any contingency; but it is because you say that you want to maintain British rule in India thut you want a European army there as strong as possible, to defend it both against Russia and against the Indians?—Sir R. KNOX: We supply the demands made upon us by the Indian Government.

12,602. Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, but the Indian Government is the British Government. The Indian Government is nothing but British Government and British rule.

Later, Mr. NAOROJI proceeded with the examination of Sir Ralph Knox.

12,795. Mr. NAOROJI: We are at present at the second part of our reference, the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested. I have a short extract, a few sentences from Lord Kimberley's speech, reported in *The Times* of the 13th June, 1893:—"There is one point upon which I imagine, whatever may be our party politics in this country, we are all united; that we are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian empire. That I conceive is a matter about which we have only one opinion, and let me tell you that that supremacy rests upon three distinct bases. One of those bases, and a very important one, is the loyalty and goodwill of the native princes and population over whom we rule. Next, and not less important, is the maintenance of our European Civil Service, upon which rests the foundation of our administration in India. . . . . Last, not because it is the least, but because I wish to give it the greatest prominence, we rest also upon the magnificent European force which we maintain in that country, and the splendid army of native auxiliaries by which that force is supported. . , . . Let us firmly and calmly maintain our position in that country; let us be thoroughly armed as to our frontier defences, and then, I believe, we may trust to the old vigour of the people of this country, come what may, to support our supremacy in that great empire." From this extract it is clear that Great Britain has an immense and vital interest in the keeping up of the European services, both in India and in this country, and not only of the European services but also of the native army. It bases its very existence upon these services. Well, I will put aside the natives employed in the native army, who would be required under any circumstances, by the natives themselves; but taking only the European portion of it, it is clear that England has a distinct interest, granted that India also has a distinct interest, in keeping up these European services. Considering, therefore, such vital interests of Britain, I should like to know whether and what apportionment should take place between Britain and India on account of these European services, both in this country and in India?—It is a very big question to ask me, but if my opinion is of any value I should say that India ought pay the very last halfpenny.

12,796. Even though we are now discussing this question, portionment of charge between the Governments of the Kingdom and India, for purposes in which both are interested? Here is a purpose in which England is most vitally interested, the maintaining of its own very existence in the country, and yet I am to understand that England should contribute nothing towards its own benefit, and that India should be simply treated as a helot?—My own view is that England has made India what India is. That England has made India what she is by means, to a very great extent, of the residence of the European army in India. I believe that the condition in which India is, a condition which England has made, is a condition which is enormously to the advantage of the natives of India, and that her rule is exercised wholly and solely in the interests of the people of India.

12,797. It is entirely the reverse. The whole rule is conducted for the benefit of England; England has derived an immense, or many times greater, benefit from India than India has derived from the rule of England. That is a question that I could not, and that we could not, enter into just now, but this is my simple question: wherever any purpose is for the interests of both, should not there be an apportionment of charge. That is the subject just now before the Commission, and I ask that in this case where the purpose is one in which England is also very decidedly interested, that England should contribute its proper share, and you give the opinion that England should not. Then with regard to the frontier wars, I may read one or two extracts. Mr. Fawcett pointed out in his speech on the subject of the Afghan war, that it was a remarkable thing that every speech made in the House or out of it, by ministers or their supporters, on the subject, showed that the war was a great Imperial enterprise. He said: "And, fourthly, the most important question, so far as he was able to judge, of who was to pay the expenses of the war . . . . It seemed to be quite clear that the expenses of the war should not be borne by India, and he wished to explain that so far as India was concerned this was not to be regarded as a matter of generosity, but of justice and legality. . . . . The matter must be decided on grounds of strict justice and legality. Hansard, Vol. 250. . . . . (P. 457). It was a remarkable thing that every speech made in that House or out of it by ministers or their supporters on the subject showed that the war was a great Imperial enterprise, those who opposed the war having always been taunted as being 'parochial' politicians who could not appreciate the magnitude and importance of great Imperial enterprises. . . . . (p. 458). He would refer to the speeches of the Viceroy of India, the Prime Minister, and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs upon the subject. . . . . In December 1878, the noble Earl—the Prime Minister—warned the Peers that they must extend their range of vision, and told them that they were not to suppose that this was a war which simply concerned some small cantonments at Dakka and Jellalabad, but one undertaken to maintain the influence and character not of India, but of England in Europe. Now, were they going to make India pay the entire bill for maintaing the influence and character of England in Europe. . . . . his lordship the Marquis of Salisbury, treated the war as indissolubly connected with the Eastern question. . . . . Therefore it seemed to him (Mr. Fawcett) that it was absolutely impossible for the Government, unless they were prepared to cast to the winds their declarations, to come down to the House and regard the war as an Indian one . . . . . All he desired was a declaration of principle, and he would be perfectly satisfied if someone representing the Government would get up and say that they had always considered this war as an Imperial one, for the expenses of which England and India were jointly liable."

Lord Beaconsfield says:—"That the real question at issue was whether England should possess the gates of her own great Empire in India . . . . We resolved that the time has come when this country should acquire the complete command and possession of the gates of the Indian Empire. Let me, at least, believe that the Peers of England are still determined to uphold not only the Empire, but the honour of this country." And I may read several other extracts of a similar character which show that all these frontier wars that are being carried on are not only as much but a great deal more in the interests of England in maintaining its rule in India against any European nation. Is it right or is it not just that England should take the proper share in the expenses of all these countries. I regard them as beneficial to India also?—As I said, it is an extremely difficult question to answer, but my view generally in regard to frontier wars is, that they are the necessary advance of civilization against barbarism,

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

that a civilized country must advance over its frontier from time to time.

12,798. But then at whose expense; at the expense of both of those who are interested in it?—Well, it is generally at the expense of those who are on the frontier.

12,799. Who are the weakest, I suppose; that would be a proper answer, as we are entirely helpless. Well, the next question is: Have we any voice whatever in the disbursement of the revenues of India, in a single farthing of disbursement, or is it not entirely at the will, and completely despotic will, of the Indian authorities, or rather the British authorities ruling over India?—There is no systematic method that I know of consulting the wishes of the Indian people; but I believe that their best interests are considered in any policy that may be adopted.

12,800. However, we have no voice whatever, have we, in the spending of a single farthing of our own revenue. Then we will contrast the position of the Irish with that of the Indians. The Irish can occupy any position whatever in all the services all over the country. An Irishman may become a viceroy, he may become a commander-in-chief, he may become a prime minister, he may become anything. He has a complete share in the Imperial benefits, if he contributes also to the Imperial expenditure or burdens. Has India any such position in the Imperial arrangements?

Sir JAMES PEILE: Has this anything to do with the Indian expenditure?

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes; it is absolutely necessary for me to put these questions.

Sir JAMES PEILE: Is it connected with our Indian expenditure?

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

Sir JAMES PEILE: Questions about the Irish?

Mr. NAOROJI: Because the whole of the military expenditure is thrown on India. I maintain that the British Government and the British people, being vitally interested in it, should be charged with an apportionment of the charge that is incurred for the British service. That is all that I ask; and I want to point out the difference between thetreatment, leaving alone the question of home rule for Ireland, for which I am not here contending, but taking Irish as being in the same position as British subjects and Imperial subjects, and the constant and repeated declarations of a century, I maintain that the Indians are also to be treated as British subjects and equal to any other British subjects; are the Indians so treated?

Sir JAMES PEILE: We are dealing with the apportionment of the military expenditure.

Mr. NAOROJI: That comes necessarily as an apportionment of the expense to India.

CHAIRMAN: I think we have to bear this in mind, that this question about the employment of the natives in India is hardly one which comes within the cognizance of Sir Ralph Knox. He is simply a War Office officer. You may put your questions, Mr. Naoroji, and I think probably we had better leave Sir Ralph to give his answers.

12,801. Mr. NAOROJI: He may give any answer he thinks proper?—Sir R. KNOX: Well, I should think it was merely, to a great extent, a matter of time. It is only recently, in comparatively recent years, really within my memory, that Irishmen have been admitted to the highest posts in this Kingdom. They were excluded until comparatively recent years from very many positions within this century; but now we have considerably advanced. I should think the time will come when there will be a considerable advance also in regard to the position of many Indians in India too.

12,802. Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, but at some time, therefore, we come back to the same question, that in all those purposes in which Indian revenue is expended, if it is for the benefit of both, the English revenue ought to share its proper expenditure as a partner of the British Empire, as we are always told that we are partners in the British Empire, and that as Imperial citizens we must bear Imperial burdens. At the same time we ask that, as Imperial citizens, we should have a share in the Imperial services. Now we have no share in the army. No Indian can ever be appointed to a commission in the army?—Sir R. KNOX: But the native army is twice the size of the European army.

12,803. Mr. NAOROJI: The native army is paid by the natives themselves, but the European army there is entirely for the purposes of British rule, not for the purposes of India?—Sir R. KNOX: Still there is plenty of military employment for the natives of India.

12,804. There must be a division of expenditure from both Governments where the necessity of any particular purpose is for the interests of both.

Twenty-Eighth Day. Wednesday, July 22nd, 1896.

Witness: SIR RALPH KNOX.

13,026. Mr. NAOROJI: I have to make a request to Sir Ralph Knox. If I want it you will give me a short time next Wednesday, because I think I require an explanation upon some statements made by you last Wednesday. I have to ask whether you will be good enough to give me a short time next Wednesday?—Yes, I shall be here.

Twenty-ninth Day. Wednesday, July 29th, 1896.

Witness. VISCOUNT WOLSELEY.

Mr. Naoroji first intervened when Lord Wolseley stated that "his idea with regard to the charges generally for the troops in India was that India should pay for everything connected with the army." "I say," Lord Wolseley declared, "supposing we had no British Empire and no British rule in India to be maintained, we shold not have those batteries and these fortifications, and consequently, as we have India, and we have these batteries, India should pay for them." The report proceeds as follows:—

13,188. Mr. NAOROJI: But is it not for the sake of maintaining the British rule that all this British army and British fortifications and all these are there?—Lord WOLSELEY: No; it is for the purpose——

13,189. If British rule were not there you would not care a straw for India and would not go there?—Quite.

13,190. And you would not impose a British army upon India?—We do not impose a British army upon India; India asks for it.

13,191. You have a large European army imposed upon India for the purpose of maintaining British rule?—Why do you use the word "imposed"?

13,192. Because it is not with our consent; we have no voice; India has no voice?—That is a point I cannot go into.

The phrase "Indian requirements" being frequently employed, Mr. Naoriji again intervened:

13,243. Mr. NAOROJI: When you use the phrase that "India requires" or "when India's emergency takes place" what do you mean? It is not India that requires these troops annually; properly speaking is it not Great Britain that requires these troops there to maintain her own rule there; otherwise India would not require any troops from you?—Lord WOLSELEY: I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

13,244. Mr. NAOROJI: Is it not for British purposes?—Lord WOLSELEY: I hope you will excuse me and pardon me, but that is a subject I cannot go into.

13,245. Mr. NAOROJI: It is rather unfair that repeatedly the expression is used "India's wants and India's requirements," and that these things are required in India's interests, when in reality it is all British interests, British wants, British purposes, in order to maintain British rule in India and nothing from England can ever be required.

Mr. JACKSON: But surely that assumes that the British rule in India is of no value to India.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is of value to India, but is of value to Great Britain also.

Mr. JACKSON: Then, if it is of value to India, it is for India's requirements, India's interests, India's wants.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is for Britain also. Whatever is necessary for British rule should be supplied by Britain just as well as India. Is there not equal benefit, is there not benefit to both? This is all upon the supposition that it is all for the benefit of India, and Britain has simply nothing but a Quixotic

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

philanthropic purpose, for which it comes to India and saves India from Russian aggression.

13,246. Mr. JACKSON: I do not understand the argument?—Lord WOLSELEY: I cannot follow the argument, but I would merely say that my views are that India never existed as India at all until we went there. She was merely an agglomeration of small States, the Muhammadans cutting the throats of the Hindus, with constant and continual internal troubles. India has been constituted an empire by us; everything that India has got at the present moment that is worth having has been derived from English rule. That is the only commentary I have to make as regards what Mr. Naoroji has to say.

Mr. NAOROJI: I had better say a few words afterwards.

CHAIRMAN: I think we must bear in mind that the English rule exists in India, and that it is not within the scope of our enquiry to go into the question of what would follow the removal of that rule or what would happen if that rule had never existed.

Mr. NAOROJI: That question arises from the kind of remarks that are made; otherwise I confine myself to expenditure when I come to it.

Later, Lord WOLSELEY said: "I saw one Eurasian regiment, and I never saw a more wretched, useless, or miserable body of men in my life. I saw them during the Mutiny; they would not fight, they were always grumbling, they did nothing." The report continues:

13,384. Mr. NAOROJI: Our object in this Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country in matters in which both are interested. You say England has done so much for India, but India must pay every farthing. Now let me read you a short statement?—Lord WOLSELEY: I cannot answer anything connected with the political condition of India. I am here to give you purely military opinions and answer military questions.

13,385. Sir DONALD STEWART: May I ask one question about the army medical establishment? Have you got any views upon the subject of the amalgamation of the two branches of the army medical service, the Indian and the British?—Lord WOLSELEY: Yes, I think that would be a saving for India; I think it is a pity it is not done.

13,386. CHAIRMAN: Amalgamation of the two services?—To have only one medical service for India would be a saving to India, and it would not hurt us, according to my notions.

13,387. Sir DONALD STEWART: It would not disturb the efficiency?—According to my notion it would not.

13,388. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Naoroji, you heard what Lord Wolseley said. Of course it is for you to consider whether your questions go outside the line upon which you can expect him to give an answer.

Mr. NAOROJI: I have to put questions within our Commission's reference, and I should have answers from Lord Wolseley just as he thinks proper; but my questions should be put, because the question has to be considered from the Indian point of view.

CHAIRMAN: I am speaking in consequence of what Lord Wolseley said to you. We must bear in mind that questions must come within the scope of our reference. You say their subject comes within that scope, but I think you have gone rather close upon the limits of our reference occasionally.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes; but there are several statements made by Lord Wolseley which require to be controverted, and especially one which I would just take—Lord Wolseley urged very strongly that England made India. Now that is a point upon which there is another side of the picture also and I must therefore have that side put in; and, besides, he said that India is not a whole nation; that is not a necessity. India is like Europe, you may say, a large continent, and there were several native powers instead of one native power. That does not answer in any way the question I want to put; I want to say—perhaps the question has been misunderstood and muddled up a good deal—that our object here in the Commission is to ascertain what apportionment should be charged to each country for purposes in which both are interested. I want therefore to bring out those purposes in which both England and India are interested, and what England ought to contribute towards the apportionment as well as India. I am not saying that the whole benefit is British. I grant that whatever is done in the whole administration, India has its benefit; but England also has its benefit and therefore what portion should England pay for all that administration; and that is what I have to bring out, because that is the principal question for which the Commission is formed.

13,388. CHAIRMAN: Just bear in mind what the scope of our Commission is, and also bear in mind what Lord Wolseley's position is.—If I might say so, those all are questions of relative advantages, but upon those I cannot be expected to give evidence; I can only give you evidence upon facts.

13,389. Mr. CAINE: Lord Wolseley is an expert witness upon specific points?—On facts.

Mr. CAINE: He really ought only to be examined upon matters upon which he himself is an expert witness.

13,390. CHAIRMAN: Quite so.—And upon facts. I am not prepared to enter into problematical questions as to what would be the future.

Mr. NAOROJI: I am not putting problematical questions. I wish to give facts as they exist, and I want to ascertain them from Lord Wolseley, if he says he cannot answer those questions——

Mr. JACKSON: May we not have this question?

CHAIRMAN: Time gets on; please put your question.

13,391. Mr. NAOROJI: Lord Wolseley, you may have read an extract from Lord Kimberley's speech that I gave at the time of the examination of Sir Ralph Knox?—Yes; I read all the questions that you put to Sir Ralph Knox, and I am not prepared to answer any of them.

13,392. Very well, then. Of course, if you are not prepared, and will not answer ——?—It is not a question of "will not."

Mr. JACKSON: I do not think it ought to be put—here we are in the presence of reporters—that Lord Wolseley "will not" answer the question. I do not think that responsibility ought to be put on Lord Wolseley.

13,393. Mr. NAOROJI: Having had a definite answer, I am not going to put those questions now. I only put a question which arises from Lord Wolseley's assumption as to what England has done for India. He bases all his argument upon the assertion that England has done so much for India that India must pay every farthing.

Mr. JACKSON: Will you not put the question?

Lord WOLSELEY: That is a historical question into which I am not prepared to enter. I am quite prepared to answer you any questions that you will ask me bearing on the establishment of the army or the efficiency of the army, either in England or in India, or anything that comes within the scope of my own duties, but nothing else.

13,394. Mr. NAOROJI: Then it is very unfortunate that you made the remark several times that India was made by England what it was, and therefore India must pay every farthing for whatever England has to spend or whatever England imposes upon it, and you even demur to the word "imposing." Well, therefore, unfortunately, these remarks being made I was bound to ask questions?—I am much obliged to you for your commentary on my evidence.

13,395. Mr. NAOROJI: Of course, if I am not to put this question or to go into this matter I, of course, yield to the decision of the Chairman. I only wanted to ask these questions because these remarks were made.

Mr. CAINE: We ought to discriminate a little in the questions. I do not attach any importance to what Lord Wolseley says on historical questions, but I attach the highest importance to what he says on military questions, and, when we come to report, I do not suppose that we shall be influenced in the drafting of our report by any opinion that Lord Wolseley gives either on political questions or on historical questions?—They will be of no value.

13,396. We only deal with what he says on military questions—These are the only remarks of value in this enquiry.

CHAIRMAN: I think we ought to go farther than that. I do not think that questions simply involving policy ought to be put to a witness like Lord Wolseley, because it is rather hard upon a witness to have to reply, "I shall not," or "I cannot answer that question." I think the questions ought not to be put to him.

Mr. NAOROJI: I demur to the statement that I have said one single word to him upon a question of policy. I ask to put

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

questions to Lord Wolseley, and he can make any answer to them he chooses.

Mr. JACKSON: We have not heard the question. Let us hear it put.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you will put your question; we quite understand what the position is.

13,397. Mr. NAOROJI: Very well: with regard to what England has done for India, for her benefit or for her injury, I will just read a short statement?—Might I beg you to ask me a question? I shall be very glad to answer it. I do not want an essay read to me about what has taken place at some previous period of history. If you will ask me a question I will do my best to answer it, but to hear you read out some essay upon some problem would be of no use to me, and I am afraid I could give you no valuable reply to it.

13,398. If I ask my question I must explain what I mean. I will put the question at once. You state that England made India. I say that India has made England the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world, while the British administration, under the British authorities—not by the British people——

Mr. JACKSON: I think that should be given as evidence; that is not a question, is it?

Mr. NAOROJI: I want to ask this question: what England has done for India? I want to point out that England has done the greatest possible material injury to India. I ask the question, is it so, or not?

CHAIRMAN: Is not that a matter for you to give in evidence?

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes, I will give evidence.

CHAIRMAN: That is expressing your own views. We should be glad to hear them.

Mr. NAOROJI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But would it not be better to hear that from you if you went into the witness chair?

Mr. NAOROJI: Certainly, but when any witness makes a statement which ought to be controverted at once, I am obliged to intervene; otherwise, if I did not intervene, it may be taken to be my view. However, if my view is to be taken from my own evidence I am satisfied.

CHAIRMAN: If you will come in and give us evidence upon these points we shall be very glad, because it really is expressing your own view.

Mr. NAOROJI. I am asking whether Lord Wolseley's view is the same or not.

Mr. CAINE: Lord Wolseley on the subject you refer to only expresses a generally accepted opinion to which you demur and to which I demur too.

Mr. NAOROJI: It is a wrongly accepted opinion altogether, and therefore it should not go without being contradicted.

CHAIRMAN: Quite so. I know, Mr. Naoroji, your views upon this point, and I think it may be very desirable that you should have the opportunity of expressing them to us, but I think they would be expressed better in evidence than in questions to witnesses, which the witnesses cannot answer.

Mr. NAOROJI: I do not want to put any questions that the witness cannot answer, but I am quite willing to give it up.

CHAIRMAN: If you wish to give us evidence.

Mr. NAOROJI: That I have already offered. I think it is a fair way to put it.

Thirtieth Day. Tuesday, August 4th, 1896.

Witness. LORD CROMER.

Mr. NAOROJI: My lord, I have been advised, and I think it is good advice, that, as I am to be examined myself, I had better reserve all my questions for my own examination and all my criticisms, so I do not think I will trouble Lord Cromer with any questions.

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.

Digitized By Siddhanta eGangotri Gyaan Kosha

CC-0. Gurukul Kangri Collection, Haridwar.